DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 337 UD 012 132

AUTHOR	Justman, Joseph
TITLE	An Evaluation of Non-Public School Participation in District Decentralized ESEA Title I Programs.
INSTITUTION	Fordham Univ., Bronx, N.Y. Inst. for Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	Pub-70-25
PUB DATE	Aug 70
NOTE	136p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	After School Centers; Compensatory Education Programs; Decentralization; Guidance Programs; Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Parochial Schools; *Private Schools; Program Evaluation; Remedial Reading; School Districts; *School District Spending; *School Involvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York

ABSTRACT

In the 1969-70 school year, 26 of the 30 local school districts and the three demonstration school districts in New York City submitted proposals for the organization of projects to be funded under ESEA Title I programs. An analysis of the district proposals, supplemented by field investigation, indicated that 21 of the local school districts had, in fact, provided for some degree of non-public school participation in the decentralized projects for which requests for funding had been submitted. Moreover, such participation was noted in one district in one program in which non-public school involvement had not been envisaged. The three demonstration districts made no provision for non-public school participation in their decentralized projects. In all, the 21 school districts cited a total of 67 projects that entailed some measure of non-public school participation. There were the following types of projects: after school study centers, guidance programs, remedial reading programs, paraprofessional assistance, homework helper programs, in addition to bilingual, trip, and creative arts programs. (Author)

u

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
HARRY N. RIVLIN, DEAN

ED 059337

AN EVALUATION OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION IN DISTRICT DECENTRALIZED ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS

Prepared by

JOSEPH JUSTMAN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
Joseph Justman, Director

Publication No. 70-25 August 1970

UD012132

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A long list of representatives of the public and non-public schools contributed to the findings presented in this report; Title I Coordinators; Program Coordinators; Principals, Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Students, and Parents of students in both public and non-public schools; and Headquarters Title I personnel. To all of them, our gratitude for their patience and cooperation.

The Evaluation Team

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I - Executive Summary 1

Chapter II - Introduction 5

Chapter III - The Extent of Non-Public School Participation 19

Chapter IV - Program Effectiveness 55

Chapter V - Recommendations 127

Appendix 135

CHAPTER I

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the 1969-1970 school year, 26 of the 30 local school districts and the three demonstration school districts in New York City submitted proposals for the organization of projects to be funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10). The projects described in the district proposals made varying provision for the participation of non-public school pupils. An analysis of the district proposals, supplemented by field investigation indicated that 21 of the school districts had, in fact, provided for some degree of non-public school participation in a total of 68 (33.7%) of the 202 projects that were funded. The three demonstration districts made no provision for such participation in the projects that they undertook.

Interviews with program personnel and visits of sites of programs indicated that 33 of the 68 projects that were to involve non-public school pupils, parents, and/or staff as participants were implemented in whole or in part. In the remaining 35 instances, 51.5 per cent of the total number calling for non-public school involvement, the program described was not implemented, at least insofar as non-public school involvement was concerned.

A total of 170 non-public schools in New York City were designated as eligible for participation in district decentralized Title I programs. Of these, 117 (68.8%) were listed on the requests for funding submitted by the districts. It would appear that almost one-third of the non-public schools actually eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs were overlooked in the preparation of proposals by the districts. In several districts, non-public schools that did not appear on the official list circulated by the central Board of Education were referred to as participating in district decentralized Title I projects, and follow-up revealed that pupils from these ineligible non-public schools have been involved in such programs.

Participation of non-public school personnel in planning of the decentralized Title I programs in the districts was evidently minimal. While this generalization is based largely on a review of the account of planning activities summarized in project proposals submitted by the districts, interviews with non-public school personnel indicates that there was relatively little involvement of other than public school personnel and representatives of community agencies in development of overall district programs.

Review of the requests for funding submitted by the districts reveals that five of the districts developed programs that did not call for any participation on the part of non-public school personnel or pupils. In one of these districts, funds were allocated from the decentralized Title I budget to provide additional personnel to non-public schools participating in centralized non-public school projects.

In general, where programs involving non-public school pupils were implemented, the number of such pupils actually participating in the programs tended to be very small. This was particularly true of those programs located in public school buildings. For a variety of reasons (distance, need to return home before dark, fear that their children would be molested), parents were apparently hesitant about permitting their non-public school children to enroll in programs in other than their own schools. In those instances where a program was organized in a non-public school, registers and attendance were high.

All but three of the programs that were implemented were considered to have met their objectives by members of the evaluation team; it was felt that these programs merited recycling for an additional year. Indeed, some of the programs were rated so highly that extension of the program to larger groups of pupils was indicated. A complete discussion of each program appears below.

Although an evaluation of each program involving non-public school children is implicit in the discussion, the evaluation team felt that it would be unwise to present a series of recommendations directed to each of the programs that were appraised. Rather, general recommendations, directed to the total problem of non-public school participation in district decentralized Title I programs were advanced:

1. Greater provision should be made for the involvement of non-public school personnel (particularly the administrators of non-public schools) in the planning phase of the development of Title I programs.
2. Greater provision should be made for the participation of non-public school pupils in the decentralized Title I programs organized by the individual districts.
3. Improved lines of communication should be established between Title I coordinators and the non-public schools.
4. To be considered acceptable, non-public school involvement in a given program must represent more than merely token participation.
5. Wherever possible, programs that are to involve participation of non-public school pupils should be located in a non-public school building.
6. The functions to be performed by teachers and paraprofessionals serving in non-public schools should be determined jointly by the program coordinator and the administrator of the non-public school.
7. Administrators of non-public schools should participate in the process

of recruitment and training of Title I teachers and paraprofessionals.

8. Greater provision should be made for feedback concerning progress of pupils to the classroom teacher of non-public school pupils participating in Title I programs.
9. Provision should be made for maintaining comprehensive and accurate records concerning participation of non-public school pupils in Title I programs.
10. Care must be taken to organize programs as they are described in project proposals; deviations should not be permitted.
11. The central Board of Education should develop a series of criteria (population of eligible pupils, allocation of percentage of budgeted funds, and the like) to guide local school districts in apportioning services to public and non-public schools.

Each of these recommendations is directed to specific weaknesses in the program, as currently organized.

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION

In the 1969-1970 school year, 26 of the 30 local school districts and the three demonstration school districts in New York City submitted proposals for the organization of projects to be funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10). As one would expect, the projects described in the district proposals varied widely in number, nature, and scope, and made varying provision for participation of non-public school children. An analysis of the district proposals, supplemented by field investigation, indicated that 21 of the local school districts had, in fact, provided for some degree of non-public school participation in the decentralized projects for which requests for funding had been submitted. Moreover, such participation was noted in one district in one program in which non-public school involvement had not been envisaged. The three demonstration districts made no provision for non-public school participation in their decentralized projects.

In all, the 21 school districts cited a total of 67 projects that entailed some measure of non-public school participation. With the additional project noted above, there were a total of 68 projected programs that might involve non-public school children, parents, and staff to a greater or lesser degree. The following chart indicates the nature of those projects that were common to four or more districts, and the districts in which such projects were to be organized.

Table 1

ESEA Title I Projects Common to Indicated Districts

Type	Districts
1. After School Study Centers	2,8,10,14,15,20,23,24,30
2. Guidance Programs	3,5,6,13,15,16,23*,28,30
3. Remedial Reading Programs	1,6,8,14,16
4. Paraprofessional Assistance	3,4,5,6,7
5. Homework Helper Programs	1,6,10,14,17
6. Bilingual Programs	2,6,9,12
7. Trip Programs	2,7,15,28
8. Creative Arts Program	6*,8*,12,14**

*Two programs organized in this area
**Three programs organized in this area

In addition to the programs listed in Table 1, 18 additional projects, many of them unique to a single district, were projected.

In general, the nature of the services to be offered is quite clear from the "type" designation under which a given districts' program has been classified. Of course, there is considerable variation in the specifics of the program types as they were developed in each district. Such variations were seen in number of pupils reached, time of day at which the program was offered, site locations, number of paraprofessionals and professionals assigned, and extent of non-public school participation.

A. Program Objectives

Obviously, it is impossible to provide a complete list of the program objectives for each of the 72 projects cited above, particularly in view of the fact that some of these projects were not implemented. In some instances, non-public school involvement was not forthcoming, in spite of an invitation to participate. In others, the extent of non-public school involvement was so miniscule that follow-up in terms of evaluation would have involved an investment of time, personnel, and funds that would have not been repaid in the way of meaningful findings. As a consequence, only those projects common to a number of districts, or those that involved a relatively large number of pupils, are analyzed here.

1. After School Study Centers
    a. Provide remediation in the subject areas, with major emphasis on reading and mathematics.
    b. Provide tutoring in subject areas; work study and homework skills.
    c. Provide development of library skills.
    d. Provide enrichment opportunities.
    e. Improve pupil attitudes to self and school.

2. Guidance Programs

These programs varied widely from district to district. In some instances, intensive guidance was provided to children returning from institutions; in others, to children who showed difficulty in adjusting in the normal classroom. Still another program, conducted in the evening, provided career information and some on-the-job training. In the light of these variations in programs, any attempt to state objectives must be phrased in very general terms:

- a. Provide appropriate guidance services to children with problems.
- b. Improve classroom functioning of referred pupils.
- c. Improve pupil attitudes to self and school.

3. Remedial Reading Programs
    a. Improve reading skills of participating pupils, with emphasis on reading comprehension.
    b. Improve pupil attitudes to self and school.

4. Paraprofessional Assistance
    a. Provide training program for paraprofessionals.
    b. Provide assistance to classroom teachers.

5. Homework Helper Programs
    a. Provide individual assistance to pupils, with major emphasis on reading and mathematics.
    b. Improve pupil work study and homework skills.
    c. Improve pupil attitudes toward school and self.
    d. Motivate high school students toward improved academic achievement.

6. Bilingual Programs

Here, too, there was considerable variation in the nature of the programs developed by the several districts. In one district, bilingual teachers were utilized as resource persons between the school and the community; in another, bilingual teachers were used to teach the elements of Spanish to English-speaking children and the elements of English to Spanish-speaking children; in a third, the teachers were used to teach English as a second language to new arrivals. As such, the objectives of the program varied from district to district. Common objectives included:

a. Provide appropriate resource help to schools.
b. Improve orientation of non-English speaking pupils.
c. Improve bilingual and bicultural learnings.

7. Trip Programs

   a. Provide cultural experiences to vitalize school curriculum.

   b. Provide backgrounds for learning and stimulating pupil interests.

8. Creative Arts Programs

Again, these programs took various forms in the several districts -- a Film Program, a Music School, a Speech Dramatics Workshop, a Performing Arts Workshop, a Photo Skills Program -- and specific objectives will vary accordingly. Common objectives included:

   a. Improve self-expression and imagination of pupils.

   b. Train pupils in specific skills in art, music, drama and dance.

   c. Improve cooperative group efforts of pupils.

   d. Improve pupil attitudes to self and school.

B. Evaluation Objectives and Procedures

Before turning to a consideration of the evaluation objectives for the several types of projects to be evaluated, it should be noted that any evaluation of this nature would be incomplete if it failed to consider the planning that was undertaken in the development of the decentralized Title I program that was ultimately submitted by the districts. Accordingly, as a general evaluation objective, attention was directed to:

(1). Determination of the extent of non-public school involvement in district planning of decentralized Title I programs.

Moreover, two other aspects of the program common to all projects were investigated:

(2). Determination of the extent to which the program was implemented.

(3). Determination of strengths and weaknesses of program administration.

In order to determine the extent of non-public school participation in planning district decentralized Title I packages, proposals for funding submitted by the districts, which summarized planning activities, were reviewed and analyzed. This analysis was supplemented by interviews with district Title I coordinators, with district non-public school liaison personnel, and with representatives of the non-public schools in the several districts.

Determination of the extent to which each project to be evaluated was implemented was accomplished by field investigation that entailed review of official records, interviews with district Title I coordinators and non-public school liaison personnel, interviews with program directors, interviews with non-public school representatives, and observation of the on-going program by qualified observers.

Determination of the strengths and weaknesses of program administration included observation of the specific projects by qualified observers, interviews with and/or questionnaires to key administrators, professionals, and paraprofessionals participating in each project.

A discussion of the evaluation objectives and of the procedures utilized in the evaluation of the eight common types of projects that were organized is presented below. It must be emphasized, however, that this analysis is rather general in nature. The wide variation in specific aspects of the individual programs developed in the several districts made it necessary to adapt procedures in the light of the on-going program that was observed.

1. After School Study Centers
    a. Evaluation Objectives
    (1) Determination of adequacy of program in:
        (a) Providing remedial help in reading and mathematics

(b) Providing tutoring

(c) Improving pupil work-study and homework skills

(d) Providing enrichment opportunities

(2) Determination of adequacy of program in improving pupil attitudes to self and school.

Determination of the adequacy of the After School Study Centers in achieving its stated objectives involved the following activities:

a. Analysis of official records - to determine pupil attendance at the Study Center and at his home school.

b. Observation of the program in action by qualified observers to determine adequacy of tutorial and remedial sessions. (Attention was directed to rapport with pupil; diagnosis of pupil needs; development of specific remedial program for individual child; use of appropriate materials; provision for enrichment, where indicated; development of ability to work independently; etc.)

c. Interviews with teachers and paraprofessionals (if any) to determine basis for development of individual pupil program, estimate of pupil growth, pupil attitude, etc.

d. Interviews with pupil - to determine changes in attitude to self, school, program.

e. Questionnaire to home school teachers - to obtain ratings of change in pupil performance in class attitudes, etc.

2. Guidance Programs

a. Evaluation Objectives

(1) Determination of adequacy of program in providing appropriate guidance services to referred children.

(2) Determination of adequacy of program in improving classroom functioning of referred pupils.

(3) Determination of adequacy of program in improving pupil attitudes to self and school.

Determination of the adequacy of these programs in providing appropriate guidance services was determined by:

a. Analysis of official records - to determine case load, nature of problem presented by child, nature of referrals made, degree of success, as measured by case closings, etc.

b. Observation of program in action by qualified observers to determine nature of approach, skill in identification of problem areas, adequacy of techniques used, etc.

c. Interviews with professionals and paraprofessional staff - to determine guidance philosophy, evaluations of program, etc.

d. Interviews with and/or questionnaires to classroom teachers of referred pupils - to determine changes in classroom functioning and achievement of pupils, changes in pupil attitudes.

e. Interviews with pupils and, if indicated, with parents - to determine changes in pupil attitudes to self, school.

f. Analysis of pupil attendance - as one aspect of pupil attitude to school.

3. Remedial Reading Programs

a. Evaluation Objectives

(1) Determination of adequacy of program in improving reading skills of participating pupils.

(2) Determination of adequacy of program in improving pupil attitudes to self and school.

Determination of the adequacy of the program in improving reading skills and in changing the attitudes of participating pupils entailed the following activities:

a. Analysis of official records - to determine pupil attendance in the program.

b. Observation of the program in action by qualified observers to determine adequacy of remedial service offered (attention will be directed to techniques for building rapport with pupil; diagnosis of pupil needs; nature of remedial program developed for the individual child; use of appropriate materials; development of ability to work independently; provision for cooperation with classroom teacher; involvement of parent, if any; etc.)

c. Interviews with teachers and paraprofessionals (if any) - to determine basis for development of program, estimate of pupil growth in program, pupil attitudes, etc.

d. Interviews with pupil - to determine attitudes to self, school, program.

e. Questionnaire to teachers at home school - to determine changes in pupil classroom functioning, attitudes, attendance, etc.

4. Paraprofessional Assistance

   a. Evaluation Objectives

      (1) Determination of adequacy of training program for paraprofessionals.

      (2) Determination of adequacy of functioning of paraprofessionals in the classroom.

Determination of the adequacy of the training program for paraprofessionals was determined through the use of the following procedures:

a. Analysis of official records - to determine attendance at training sessions, nature of records kept, etc.

b. Observation of training program by qualified observers - attention was directed to scope and sequence of training program, availability of materials, provision for practice, adaptation to individual needs, training methods, nature of demonstrations, opportunity for questioning, follow-up activities, etc.

c. Interviews with training staff - to determine basis for organization of program, extent of preplanning, rating of participant growth, etc.

d. Interviews with paraprofessionals - to determine attitude toward training program, self-evaluation of growth, extent of training needs not met, etc.

The adequacy of paraprofessional functioning in the classroom will be determined via:

a. Observation of paraprofessional performance in the classroom - attention will be directed to rapport with pupils, adequacy of selection and use of materials, cooperation with teachers, ability to work independently, adequacy of work with parents, etc.

b. Interviews with classroom teachers and school administrators to determine adequacy of teacher - paraprofessional cooperation, rating of paraprofessional competence, problems encountered and techniques used to minimize problems, etc.

c. Questionnaires to classroom teachers and paraprofessionals - to determine background data, nature of assignments, strengths and weaknesses of program, suggestions for improvement, etc.

5. Homework Helper Programs

   a. Evaluation Objectives

      (1) Determination of adequacy of program in

         a. Providing individual assistance to pupils in reading and mathematics.

         b. Improving pupil work-study and homework skills.

      (2) Determination of adequacy of program in improving pupil attitudes to self and school.

      (3) Determination of adequacy of program in motivating high school students toward improved academic achievement and perceptions.

The techniques and procedures utilized in evaluating the Homework Helper Programs paralleled those to be used in evaluating the After School Study Centers. In view of the fact, however, that high school pupils were used as Homework Helpers in a number of instances, attention was directed to a consideration of the adequacy of the program in effecting changes in the high school students' academic achievement and self-perceptions. This was determined through interviews with the high school students, and through questionnaires directed to their teachers.

6. Bilingual Programs

   a. Evaluation Objectives

      (1) Determination of adequacy of program in providing appropriate resource help to schools.

      (2) Determination of adequacy of program in improving orientation of non-English speaking pupils.

      (3) Determination of adequacy of program in improving bilingual and bicultural learnings.

In those situations where the program took the form of providing resource personnel, the adequacy of the resource help provided was determined by:

a. Analysis of official records - to determine nature of service provided, frequency with which service is requested, service outcomes, etc.

b. Observation of program in action by qualified observers - to determine development of rapport with parents, pupils, and agencies; quality of service provided; cooperation with teachers; record-keeping; use of available community resources, etc.

c. Interviews with school administrators and teachers - to determine use of resource persons, estimate of value of services rendered, problems involved, etc.

d. Interviews with resource personnel - to determine background and experience, basic orientation, attitudes to program, etc.

The same approaches were utilized in determining the adequacy of those bilingual programs that took the form of improving the orientation of non-English speaking pupils. In those instances where the program took the form of improving bicultural and bilingual learnings, these approaches were supplemented by classroom observation of the work of the bilingual teacher, where attention was directed to pupil rapport, appropriateness of materials used, provision for pupil activity, gradation of materials, techniques used to judge pupil progress, enrichment activities, etc.

7. Trip Programs

   a. Evaluation Objectives

      (1) Determination of adequacy of programs in

         (a) Providing cultural experiences to vitalize school curriculum.

         (b) Providing backgrounds for learning and stimulating pupil growth.

The degree to which the trip programs succeeded in achieving their stated goals was determined through use of the following approaches:

a. Analysis of official records - to develop data concerning frequency of trips, sites visited, number of pupils participating, etc.

b. Observation of groups participating in trips, including observation of class during preparation for trip, during course of the trip, and during follow-up activities - to determine (a) preparation of pupils (what to look for, observation guides, behavioral guides, etc.); (b) pupil learnings (questions asked, note-taking, completion of observational guides, behavior during trip, group cooperation, etc.); (c) reinforcement in follow-up (review activities, use of trip as springboard for enrichment, integration with classroom work, etc.).

c. Interviews with pupils - to determine pupil attitudes to self and school.

d. Interviews with classroom teachers - to determine values of trip in relation to class work, pupil attitudes, effectiveness as learning device, etc.

8. Creative Arts Programs

   a. Evaluation Objectives

      (1) Determination of adequacy of program in

         (a) Improving self-expression and imagination of pupils.

         (b) Training pupils in specific skills.

      (2) Determination of adequacy of program in improving cooperative group behavior of pupils.

      (3) Determination of adequacy of program in improving pupil attitudes to self and school.

Because of the wide variation in programs in this general area, it is difficult to cite specific evaluation procedures that were common to all programs. For those programs that involved creative expression in language arts (writing scripts, etc.), the adequacy of the program in fostering the development of specific skills and in improving self-expression was gauged by evaluating pupil products. In addition, the programs were observed by qualified observers, who directed their attention to such aspects of the teaching process as teacher rapport with pupils, adequacy of materials used, use of individual and small group instructional techniques, gradation in presentation of skills, pupil motivation, etc. Pupils were interviewed to determine attitudes, degree of independent activity in arts area, etc. Teachers in the program were interviewed to determine training and experience, attitudes toward program, etc. Classroom teachers of participating pupils were asked to respond to a questionnaire concerning changes in pupil classroom functioning, achievement, attitudes, etc.

In those instances where the program involved drama, music, or art as a form of creative expression, pupil growth was determined by evaluation of pupil performance by qualified persons in the field.

The effectiveness of the programs in improving pupil attitudes was gauged by interview and through an analysis of pupil attendance.

CHAPTER III

THE EXTENT OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

This chapter presents an analysis of the extent of non-public school participation in district decentralized Title I programs in each of the 30 local school districts and demonstration districts that were eligible for funding. Several approaches were utilized in developing the relevant data. As a first step, the proposals submitted by the several districts were reviewed. Particular attention was directed to the extent of non-public school participation in planning activities associated with the development of the Title I program, as summarized in the district proposal. Where it was deemed necessary, interviews were held with district Title I coordinators and with district non-public school liaison personnel. In addition, a large number of visits were made to participating non-public schools to determine extent of participation.

In the sections that follow, a district by district summary will be given of the extent of non-public school participation in planning activities, and of non-public school participation in the decentralized program developed in each district.

A. District 1

Eight non-public schools (seven elementary schools and one K-8 school) in this district were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs. All of these schools were referred to in the request for funding submitted by the district.

Five representatives of non-public schools served as members of the advisory panel concerned with planning activities in relation to the Title I program developed by the district. Five meetings of this panel were held, according to the summary presented in the request for funding. However, no details were given concerning attendance of specific members of the panel at each of these meetings.

Three programs, all of which were concerned with remediation, that were developed by the district permitted participation of non-public school pupils: (1) a STAR Program, which provided supplementary teaching assistance in reading; (2) a Homework Helper Program, which provided high school students to serve as tutors; and (3) SHIFT, a program providing supplementary help in fundamental training.

Of these three programs, only the first two enrolled a substantial number of non-public school pupils. Only five such pupils, however, participated in the SHIFT Program. All of these children were drawn from a single non-public school.

Although the coordinator of the SHIFT Program felt that this minimal non-public school participation reflected lack of interest, it is evident that communication with the non-public schools regarding the program was poor. Four non-public schools were invited to join the program. In one instance, the letter of invitation indicated that "we have more than filled the space with our own children and are presently working on a waiting list," to which the names of non-public school children would be added. In the case of another non-public school, a set of forms was provided, with instructions that they be completed and returned within a single day. In two instances, non-public pupils were asked to arrive for enrollment at 3:00 P.M., and the schools were informed that enrollees must be present at that time each day. This made no provision for travel time from the non-public school to the public school.

D. District 2

Five non-public schools (four elementary schools and one high school) in this district were certified as eligible for participation in Title I decentralized programs. The two proposals for funding submitted by the district list the four elementary schools as enrolling eligible children.

There seems to have been a modicum of non-public school participation in planning activities related to the development of the first of the two decentralized Title I proposals in the district. The summary of planning sessions, outlined in the district proposal, indicates that representatives of the Archdiocese of New York were present at two planning sessions and that a principal of one of the four eligible non-public elementary schools was present at one session. There were five such sessions in all.

The second request for funding also includes a summary of planning activities related to the second group of proposals. Here, twelve planning sessions were held, two of which were restricted sessions involving six representatives of non-public schools. In addition, a non-public school representative was present at one of the other ten such sessions.

Three programs, two of which were concerned with remediation and the other with an educational trip program, that were organized by the district permitted participation of non-public school children: (1) as part of the Bilingual Program organized by the district, a half-time teacher and an educational assistant were to be assigned to the four eligible non-public schools; (2) an After School Study Center Program; and (3) an Educational Trip Program.

Of the four eligible non-public elementary schools in the District, one (Our Lady of the Scapular) reported that it was to close in September 1970 and hence did not participate in any Title I programs; another (St. Cecilia) indicated that the programs were offered to the school, but that the parents objected to the travel involved. In a third instance (St. Frances de Sales), the principal reported that she had received no information regarding the three programs, while, in the fourth school (St. Lucy), the school had been apprised of the Saturday trip program, but "it never materialized." This last school also reported that one pupil enrolled in the school was attending an After-School Study Center.

Field investigation indicates that a bilingual teacher and two paraprofessionals were finally assigned to two of the schools late in April. Considerable dissatisfaction was voiced concerning the services of the bilingual teacher, both in the language area and in communicating with people.

C. District 3

Fourteen non-public schools (thirteen K-8 schools and one K-12 school) in this district were certified as eligible for participation in Title I decentralized programs. The proposal for funding submitted by the district, however, lists only three of the elementary schools as enrolling eligible children.

Here, too, there apparently was little non-public participation in planning activities. The summary of planning activities incorporated in the district proposal indicates that one of the fifteen participants in planning sessions was a representative of the non-public schools. The summary, however, does not detail the total number of sessions that were held nor the number of sessions attended by the participants.

Two of the projects organized by the district specified involvement of non-public school children: (1) The Pilot Schools in the Home Project, which involves 100 children was to include 10 children from non-public schools;

(2) a Guidance Program was organized in the three non-public schools listed on the project proposal. In this program, a bilingual guidance team, consisting of one guidance counselor, two family assistants, and two educational assistants, operates two days each at two of these schools and one day per week at the third school.

Both of these projects were implemented.

D. District 4

Nine non-public elementary schools in this district were certified as eligible for participation in Title I decentralized programs. Although none of these schools was listed as participating schools in the request for funding submitted by the district, reference was made to the nine schools in one of the projects described.

Evidently, there was considerable participation in planning activities on the part of representatives of the non-public schools. Eight such representatives attended some or all of the four planning sessions that were held, according to the summary statement in the request for funding.

Only one of the projects organized in this district involved non-public school participation. This project called for the provision of supportive help through the assignment of 23 paraprofessionals to the nine eligible schools. Although some difficulty was experienced in recruitment of paraprofessionals for service in these schools, this project was implemented.

E. District 5

Ten non-public schools (nine elementary schools and one intermediate school) were certified as eligible for participation in Title I decentralized programs in this district. Nine of these schools were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district. The request adds a tenth school (Manhattan Day School) as serving eligible children, but this school does not appear on the listing prepared by the Board of Education.

The request for funding prepared by the District contained a summary of activities related to planning the overall proposal for the district. There was no indication of non-public school participation in planning activities in this summary.

Two of the projects described in the proposal for funding involved non-public schools. A Parent Teacher Team project provided nine educational assistants and nine teacher aides for service in ten non-public schools. A Career Guidance for Disadvantaged Children Project called for guidance of an unspecified number of non-public school children.

The first of these two projects was fully implemented. The Career Guidance program actually serviced a total of two non-public school pupils; as such, it cannot be considered as one which truly provided for non-public school involvement. (A more complete discussion of this program appears in Chapter III.)

F. District 6

Ten non-public schools (nine elementary schools and one high school) were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs. All of these schools were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district. An eleventh school that does not appear in the listing of eligible schools prepared by the Board of Education was also listed.

The request for funding summarized activities related to planning the decentralized Title I program in the district. Evidently, eight such planning sessions were held between June 11, 1969 and October 10, 1969. A representative of the non-public schools was present at two of these sessions.

Eleven programs operating in this district (an Orientation and Adjustment

Program for New Arrivals; an Early Childhood Enrichment Program; a Remedial Bilingual Program; an After School Art Workshop; a Homework Helper Program; a Vocational Guidance and Workshop Center; an On-the-Job Training Program; a program for Improvement of Reading Skills; a Community Children College Program - a recreational program; a program for developing Photo Skills for Pleasure and Knowledge; and Student Times - a student newspaper) that were planned for the 1969-1970 school year called for involvement of non-public school pupils. In general, ten per cent of the pupils in attendance at each activity were to be non-public school enrollees. In addition, educational assistants were to be assigned to non-public schools, and an Educational Resources Center, open to non-public schools, was to be established using Title I funds.

Actual participation by non-public school pupils and personnel in these programs was minimal. The program of Orientation and Adjustment for New Arrivals has been in existence in the district for several years. Due to the fact, however, that parents objected to sending their children to a central facility, non-public school participation dwindled over the years; this year, there was no participation on the part of non-public school pupils.

The Early Childhood Enrichment Program was designed to develop cognitive skills, independent learning and positive attitudes toward school. Class activities were scheduled daily from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon; training activities of teachers and paraprofessionals from 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. The program included language enhancement and problem solving. Activities included pre-math, pre-reading, music and outdoor experiences, such as visits to a zoo, Rockefeller Center, an airport, a bakery, and a firehouse. The personnel included a head teacher, two educational assistants, one family assistant and a clerk-typist. The program was designed to provide services for 200 pre-school children between the ages of four and six.

The program was publicized through parents associations in neighboring schools. However, according to the principals of the neighboring non-public schools, no information about the program was transmitted to the non-public schools. The principals of the neighboring non-public schools reported that they would have welcomed such a program in their schools.

While the family assistant assigned to the program reported that approximately five per cent of the children enrolled in the program had siblings attending non-public schools, this estimate appears to be much too large. In any event, participation of potential non-public school children appears to have been more accidental than planned, particularly in view of the failure to publicize the program in non-public schools. It would be improper to conclude that the accident of participation on the part of a small number of potential non-public school children constitutes implementation of the program.

The Remedial Bilingual Program was not implemented. Scheduled as open to pupils from St. Rose of Lima, the program site and time at which offered were objectionable to the parents of the children in the school, and no participation was noted. The same generalization applied to the Homework Helper Program. None of the four schools to which the program was open elected to send children. Here, too, the program was not implemented.

Three non-public schools were listed as eligible for participation in Project Turn-On, an after school art workshop. Again, no non-public school children attended.

The Community Children College Program was planned as an after school remediation and recreational program. Pupils from public and non-public schools in the City College area were to be tutored by educational assistants and student aides working under the supervision of a master teacher. In addition, pupils were to be involved in an afternoon and Saturday recreation and instruction program in athletics, to enable them to enter tournaments in swimming, basketball, track, baseball, and boxing. The site of the program was to be the buildings and athletic fields of City College.

The program was seriously limited by the decision of City College administration to deny the use of the gymnasium and pool to the program and by the inability to recruit expected number of children. The coordinator and teachers were certain, when interviewed, that non-public school pupils were involved in the program. Visits to the tutoring and recreational sessions, however, revealed that no such pupils were in attendance; the assertion that they had been in attendance, but had dropped out, could not be checked because of the lack of records of registration and attendance. Interviews with the principals of the four non-public schools mentioned in the project descriptions further revealed that they had not received any notices concerning the program. One can only conclude that there is no evidence of participation of non-public school children in the program.

The goal of Intensive On-the-job Merchandizing program was to raise the vocational horizons of the teen-agers in District 6 by developing awareness of opportunities in the field of business. It was sponsored by the Small Business Chamber of Commerce located in the heart of Harlem. The program functioned after school, three afternoons a week, from 3:30 - 6:30 at P.S. 197 Manhattan. The program was open to youngsters in grades 6-9 from nearby public and non-public schools. The staff consisted of a head teacher who was a specialist in Merchandizing and Management and three teachers who taught mathematics, accounting, speech, business decorum and sales, all subjects relevant to a career in merchandizing. The teachers were assisted by six student aides.

Pupils not only were to receive instruction in small groups in class but were also to be given the opportunity to apply the knowledge gained in classroom in actual business settings in the community. Remedial instruction was supposed to help them overcome deficiences in basic subjects and habits, the contact with actual business people to raise their self image as they worked with other members of their ethnic group who have succeeded in the field of merchandizing.

Ten percent of the thirty places in the program were reserved for pupils of three non-public schools in the area. Letters were sent to the principals of these schools describing the program and inviting participation by one pupil in each school. There was no response. Interviews with the principals of schools provided the reasons: unwillingness of the non-public school pupils to go to a strange school alone and disinclination of parents to send them, especially during the short winter days when the program was begun (November).

This program, like the others discussed above, was not implemented with respect to the non-public schools. Indeed, one may well question whether a program open to three non-public school pupils should be considered as a viable "non-public school program."

The goal of the "Student Times" program was to improve the reading and writing skills of young children (fourth grade), to produce reading materials for use by other children, and to develop journalist interest and talents.

The program was to function in two sections: 1) during regular school hours, four fourth grade classes in P.S. 200, were scheduled for language arts enrichment in Reading, Creative Writing and Spelling; 2) after school hours, forty youngsters from IS 10 and four from Resurrection and St. Charles were to be involved in producing the "Student Times", using the creative writings from section 1.

Participation by the two non-public schools was never realized. Interviews with the principals of Resurrection and St. Charles revealed that parents objected to their fourth graders traveling after school hours to a strange school and coming home after dark (the program began in November). The principals felt that such a program could just as well be duplicated in a non-public setting in the spring months.

The purpose of the "Photo Skills" program was to help children "acquire photographic skills as they relate to Reading, Math and heightened visual artistic appreciation." The site of the program was P.S. 100M; the hours between 3:00 and 5:00, three days a week. Thirty children in grades three to six were supposed to participate. Personnel included a coordinator, one teacher, two educational assistants and two consultants. Skills to be taught included taking pictures, framing, and mounting.

The principal of P.S. 100 served as program coordinator. She invited participation of a neighboring non-public school (St. Marks), but no youngsters applied. Other non-public schools in the area were not informed of the program. The principal of St. Marks indicated that the parents of the children in grades 3-6 were dubious about permitting their youngsters to go to a strange school after school hours, especially if it meant their coming home after dark. She felt that if a similar program were set up in a non-public school during the spring months, it would probably attract children from non-public schools.

"Push" was conceived as a program of guidance counseling, tutoring and small group instruction for pupils of public and non-public schools in grades 7, 8, and 9. The site is at the Vocational Guidance and Workshop Center located at 467 West 140 Street and supervised by Mrs. Kate Hicks. The staff includes, beside the director, three teachers, two guidance counselors, and six educational assistants. The program was organized to service forty-five public and non-public school adolescents four afternoons a week from 3:30 - 6:30 P.M.

The evaluator spent an entire afternoon at the Center observing, meeting staff and interviewing the director. Only a handful of students were in evidence, none of them from non-public schools. Mrs. Hicks, the director, described the program's goals and her long history of service to the confused children growing up in a slum environment. Her commitment has been to raise their sights and give them courage and skills to become economically and socially adequate. She subsequently sent a list of non-public school pupils who were attending the program. There were the names of six pupils on the list, three from Our Lady of Lourdes and three from St. Charles Borromeo schools. A questionnaire was sent to the teachers of each pupil at the two schools. From St. Charles came the response that none of the three pupils had been involved in the program; that they had merely accompanied their teacher to two vocation conferences, one of them unsuccessful because the invited speakers did not come. None of the three had returned for tutoring or counseling. From Our Lady of Lourdes school came the response that the three pupils had participated for only a brief period. They had shown no improvement in reading, mathematics, or clarity of vocational goals. In the opinion of the teachers, the center was poorly organized and did not provide the pupils with the instruction they came for, so they soon dropped out.

Here, too, the extent of non-public school participation is so small, one can hardly classify this program as having been implemented.

Of the 13 projects noted above, ten were either not implemented at all, or non-public school involvement was so small as to be considered negligible. Only three programs, the Educational Resource Center, the Program for the

Improvement of Reading Skills, and the Program for Assignment of Educational Assistants were implemented; in the case of these three programs, planned implementation was not fully realized (See Chapter III).

G. District 7

Eleven non-public elementary schools, all of which were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district, were eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district.

Planning activities in the development of the Title I program were summarized in the proposal submitted by the district. A Title I Committee consisting of 14 members, three of whom represented non-public schools, assisted in the promulgation of the program. No details are given in the proposal concerning the number of meetings that were held or of the extent to which each member of the committee participated in decision making.

Four programs (a Trip Program, a Community-School Relations Weekend Conference, a program for Placement of Educational Assistants in Non-Public Schools, and an Indoor Winter Sports program) that were organized in the district permitted participation of non-public school pupils or personnel. All of these programs, with the exception of the Indoor Winter Sports program, were implemented to some degree.

The "Indoor Winter Sports" program was organized to provide recreation, sports instruction, leadership, and guidance for boys and girls in junior, senior high schools and to out of school youth in the District 7 community. It was scheduled to function three evenings a week in ten public school buildings. It called for intensive instruction in basketball for boys and volleyball for girls. A schedule was arranged for contests among the teams in the ten schools. In addition, there were to be guidance counselors in three of the centers to discuss vocational, educational, and personal problems facing adolescents, and to develop the desire to remain in school. Coaches and educational assistants were expected to make appropriate referrals.

The staff was to consist of a teacher in charge, four recreation teachers, eight educational assistants and consultants - professional athletes and coaches. There was provision for five guidance counselors.

The project plan provided for 432 participants, 44 from non-public schools. Twenty four basketball teams, each consisting of fifteen boys and twelve volleyball teams each consisting of six girls were to be organized. A bulletin from District 7 office was circulated among the public schools, describing the program, indicating the sites, and listing name and telephone number of the coordinator. However, no publicity was sent to the eleven eligible non-public schools in the district.

In January, the assistant Title I coordinator of the district reported that there were six boys from non-public schools in the program and that "in view of this small number of children from the non-public schools, the coordinator is now in process of organizing a full team or teams from the non-public schools." No such teams were ever organized. The six boys on the list were from non-eligible schools. The project coordinator claimed that he had invited the non-public schools but they had not responded. The principals of all non-public schools totally denied that they had been informed of the existence of the program.

H. District 8

Two non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. Neither of these schools were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district.

The funding request, which summarized district activities in planning its decentralized Title I program, provided little information concerning such activities. Evidently, two persons representing non-public schools participated in district planning meetings, but no details were available concerning the number of meetings that were held, the topics discussed, or the specific persons present at such meetings.

Five of the proposals described in the district proposal made provision for the participation of non-public school pupils. Field investigation indicated that only one of these projects, a reading program in one of the eligible non-public schools, actually involved non-public school pupils. The other four projects (Performing Arts Workshop, After School Study Centers, a Community Library Program, and a Film Study Club) did not attract non-public school enrollees.

I. District 9

Three non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. Two of these schools were referred to in the request for funding submitted by the district. A third non-public school was also listed, but this school does not appear among the schools certified as eligible by the Board of Education.

According to the summary presented in the request for funding, two non-public schools were included among the schools and agencies that participated in the three meetings that were held to plan Title I activities in the district. No details concerning the nature or extent of such participation were given in this summary.

Only one program, a Bilingual Program, in the district involved non-public school participation. Originally planned to include two non-public schools, the program was extended to a third in mid-year. Some difficulties were experienced in recruitment of personnel for the program, but it was ultimately implemented as planned.

J. District 10

Four non-public schools (three elementary schools and one K-9 school) were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. All of these schools were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district.

Planning for the Title I program in this district, as described in the proposal submitted by the district, was limited to a single planning session attended by 13 persons, one of whom was a representative of a non-public school.

Two of the projects organized in this district were to involve non-public school pupils. A total of approximately 60 such pupils were to be enrolled in an After School Study Center or in a Homework Helper Program.

Field investigation indicated that the four eligible non-public schools did not participate in these two programs. Although all of the eligible non-public schools were invited to participate, the parents sending children to these schools felt that they did not wish to enroll their children in an After-School Program that was conducted in a comparatively distant public school or in a Homework Helper Program that was not located on their own school premises.

K. District 12

Four non-public elementary schools in this district were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs. Three of these schools were listed on the request for funding submitted by the district.

The request for funding summarized district activities in planning the Title I program. This summary named five representatives of non-public schools who participated in planning sessions, but no details were given concerning the meetings that were held or the frequency of attendance of the non-public school representatives at these meetings.

Three of the programs that were organized in this district permitted participation of non-public school pupils and personnel: (1) Program for Teaching English as a Second Language; (2) Creative Teachers Mini Fund; and (3) Performing Arts Workshop. The first of these programs provided for the placement of a teacher and a paraprofessional in the three non-public schools identified in the request for funding. This program was implemented in November 1969 in one school, and in January 1970 in the other two schools. Delay in implementation was attributed to difficulty in recruiting personnel.

The Creative Teachers Mini Fund, in effect, was a means of providing a source of petty cash funds for teacher purchase of supplies. The indications are that non-public school personnel were not aware of the existence of the fund; no non-public school teacher availed herself of the opportunity to purchase supplies through the fund. It should be noted that there may be some legal restrictions concerning non-public school use of funds in this manner.

The Performing Arts Workshop did not enlist any pupils who attended non-public schools during the current year, although it had done so in the past.

L. District 13

Twelve non-public schools (eleven 1-8 schools and one K-9 school) were certified as eligible for participation in Title I decentralized programs in this district. Only four of these schools, however, were referred to in the request for funding submitted by the district.

The request for funding submitted by the district, which summarized planning activities, indicated that one of the nine members of the Title I Standing Committee in the district was a representative of the non-public schools, and that representatives of eleven of the eligible non-public schools in the district participated in planning sessions. However, no details concerning extent of such participation were given.

Two of the projects organized in the district entailed non-public school involvement. In one of these projects, additional guidance services were provided in four of the eligible non-public schools. Two guidance counselors and two educational assistants were assigned to each of the four schools on a one-day per week basis. This program, in effect, was a "plug-in" to a centralized program, and is not evaluated in this report. The Community Resource Team merits more extended consideration. The description of this program, culled from the project proposal, is of interest:

"The Community Resource Team will serve all Title I programs in District 13. This team will provide the following services:

a) Organization of parent workshops to disseminate information about Title I programs.

b) Working with individual pupils and program personnel in order to improve pupil-pupil and pupil-staff relationships.

c) Helping program staff members to make better use of community resources.

d) Tutoring individual pupils who fail to make adjustments in educational programs.

e) Gathering data about Title I programs on behalf of the Advisory Committee in order to provide that group with information which may be helpful in future planning.

f) Assisting with joint training of auxiliary and professional personnel.

Personnel

1 Teacher

1 Clerk Typist

1 Parent Program Assistant

7 Educational Assistants

Training

The Parent Program Assistant and 7 Educational Assistants will receive orientation and training from the teacher and training consultants."

The Parent Program Assistant and the 7 Educational Assistants were trained by three staff members of Brooklyn College during three weeks of the summer of 1969. However, they discarded all but one function listed above. In practice, the project was converted to a program of evaluation of District 13 decentralized projects by the Parent Program Assistant and the 7 Program Assistants. The other services outlined in the project description were disregarded.

The four non-public schools listed in the District 13 project application as potential recipients of the project services were unaware of the "Community Resource Team" Program until the team appeared in order to evaluate the Title I program "Additional Guidance Services in Non-Public Schools." Since the program had been transferred to the Title I Central Administration as a "plug-in," the team was referred to Central Administration, which denied the team access to the personnel of the plug-in program. Misunderstanding and recrimination followed; in the end the Team felt that the non-public schools had denied them access to a legimate exercise of their function. An interview of the principals of the schools and with Title I Central Offices confirmed the fact that the schools had no jurisdiction over centralized programs with respect to observation of personnel.

The Community Resource Team program was subverted; it failed to provide the services described in the "Applicant for Grant"; the District evidently permitted this subversion and the assumption of a function that was not given to the Community Resource Team.

M. District 14

Twenty-four non-public schools (23 elementary schools and one high school) in this district were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs. Eighteen of these elementary schools were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district. The request also added a school which did not appear in the list of schools certified as eligible prepared by the Board of Education.

District activities related to planning the Title I program were summarized in the request for funding submitted by the District. Four such planning sessions were held, and two representatives of non-public schools were among the 17 community and school personnel who constituted the Title I Committee that was instrumental in drawing up the district program. No details were given, however, concerning the number of planning sessions attended by each Committee member.

Nine of the programs (Operation Music School, Out of School Study Club, Homework Helper in Hebrew Day Schools, Young Audiences, Speech Dramatics Workshop, Evening Community Centers, Students and Urban Society, Reading Skills Study Center, and Adaptive Physical Education) organized in the district were described as open to non-public school children. Although the request for funding did not refer to non-public school participation in a science club project organized by the District, some non-public school pupils did participate.

Field investigation indicated that three of the programs noted above failed to involve non-public school pupils:

The Evening Community Centers program was "to provide recreation and physical activity for eligible Title I children" in District 14. The centers were located at P.S. 23 and I.S. 318, and were staffed by a teacher-in-charge, two teachers of health and recreation, and an attendant to serve as door guard and building patrol. Each center was supposed to serve a maximum of 100 children per session "from eligible public and non-public schools."

The coordinator of the program reported that non-public schools were duly notified. However, of the four eligible non-public schools in the area of the two evening centers, only one principal reported being aware of the program. Attendance by non-public school pupils was low. The coordinator reported that only four non-public school pupils attended the evening centers (two of them from a school in a neighboring school district); the principals reported a total of twelve pupils as having attended the centers. The principals felt that the low rate of participation of non-public school pupils had no reference to the quality of the evening center program. The parents were fearful of their children going through the neighborhood in the evening hours.

The Speech Dramatics Workshop program was a continuation and expansion of a previous Title I program. In its origin it encompassed a single school as a voluntary, after-school enrichment program. It was to be expanded for the 1969-1970 school year to reach into five Junior High Schools. Each of these schools was to have a speech dramatics workshop enrolling thirty junior high school students (selected from the participating school and the surrounding non-public schools); two teachers and two paraprofessionals. Each workshop was to meet for sixty sessions from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m. Teachers, and possibly paraprofessionals, were to hold regular staff meetings to discuss and plan materials for the workshops.

The five schools invited to participate were J.H.S. 33, I.S. 49, J.H.S. 50, J.H.S. 126 and I.S. 318. Student participants were to be selected according to their interests in speech and dramatics and through the recommendations of teachers. No attempt was made to enlist non-public school participation.

Students and Urban Society was designed to accomodate approximately 150 children in five centers in the District. The Centers were all located in Intermediate or Junior High Schools of the District, and it was anticipated that thirty children in eighth grade would be registered in each of the schools. The plan called for enrollment of a "select group" of eighth graders from both public and non-public schools.

It was intended that this program would vitalize learning in the Social Studies area of the curriculum, with special focus on the topical area in the curriculum entitled "Our Urban Society". The children in the project were intended to split up into working teams, and to discover effective means of improving their local communities. As the project was originally developed, a by-product of the project would be the development of a magazine on Urban Society, which might be employed as supplementary material for daily lessons in Social Studies by other eighth graders in the district schools.

As the project was originally planned, the children in each junior high school group would be taught by a licensed social studies teacher in their daily meetings (two days per week), under the supervision of a licensed supervisor and under the overall direction of a coordinator. Educational assistants would be provided in each center, and a project secretary would be available to maintain teacher records, prepare reports, and type manuscript for the proposed publication.

Although the expected pupil population was to be drawn from public and non-public schools, there was no evidence that any non-public school student was in fact involved. The time schedule, which began exactly at 3:00 P.M., might have been a factor in this absence of non-public participation; the special emphasis on the revised public school curriculum would seem to have been an important factor; and the fact that conversations with non-public school principals indicated that the individual building principals were not directly informed of the project seems to have been a final, perhaps most important, factor in the non-participation by non-public school students. The on-site school location in a public school might have influenced some non-public school students to be reluctant to participate in any program.

N. District 15

Twelve non-public schools (eleven elementary schools and one K-11 school) were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. The eleven elementary schools were all listed in the request for funding submitted by the district.

A brief summary of district activities in planning its Title I program was given in the request for funding. While representatives of non-public schools may have attended planning sessions by virtue of membership in community agencies, no direct mention was made of non-public school participation in planning.

Three of the programs in this district permitted involvement of non-public school pupils. Two of these programs (After School Study Centers and Saturday and Holiday Bus Trips) were implemented. An Afro-Mediterranean Center did not attract non-public school pupils, since the program operated during the school day.

O. District 16

Eight non-public schools (seven elementary schools and one K-11 school) were certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. Only the seven elementary schools were listed in the request for funding of Title I projects submitted by the district.

Three representatives from non-public schools served as members of the district Title I Review Committee, which constituted the planning agency for Title I programs in the District. The request for funding submitted by the district indicated that the twelve members of this committee met "each month to discuss, review and evaluate Title I programs." Specific reference was made, however, to only one such meeting, to which nine "guests" were invited, none of whom was affiliated with non-public schools.

Three of the projects that were organized by this district permitted non-public school participation: (1) Early Childhood Library; (2) Parent Involvement Program; and (3) Operation Target, a program providing educational therapy to pupils in grades 5 through 9. Although participation of the non-public schools in the latter two programs was relatively small, all three programs could be looked upon as having been implemented.

P. District 17

Ten non-public schools (eight elementary schools and two junior-senior high schools) were certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. None of these schools were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district.

This district organized an Education Advisory Committee on State and Federal Programs to assist in planning Title I activities. This committee consisted of some 20 members, in addition to representatives of the district's non-public schools, and met weekly. Attendance at meetings during June and July, 1969 was summarized in the request for funding. Review of this material indicated that non-public school representatives were present at four of the six meetings held during this time. At two of these meetings non-public school representatives discussed priorities with the district Title I coordinator; other community agencies were not represented.

The original description of projects to be undertaken in the district during the 1969-1970 school year made no reference to participation of non-public school personnel or pupils. A proposed program to organize a Homework Helper Program in Hebrew Day School was not approved, and there was no reference to this program in the first "umbrella" that was submitted. The program was finally approved in December 1969, and began operation in February 1970. This was the only program involving non-public school participation organized by the District.

Q. District 18

Only one non-public elementary school was certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. The request for funding submitted by the district made no reference to involvement of this school in projected programs, and investigation revealed no participation of personnel or pupils from this school in on-going programs.

R. District 19

Four non-public elementary schools were certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. However, there was no direct non-public school participation in decentralized programs. After consultation with various central program coordinators and the non-public school liaison representative, a sum of $42,222 was transferred from the district allocation for decentralized programs to five centralized programs: Clinical Guidance Services, Corrective Reading, Corrective Mathematics, Speech Therapy, and English as a Second Language. Additional personnel was to be allocated to the four eligible non-public schools, as part of the services provided by the centralized programs.

S. District 20

Four non-public schools (three elementary schools and one special school) were certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. None of these schools was listed in the request for funding submitted by the district.

Evidently, no representative of the eligible non-public schools was involved in planning Title I programs in the district for the 1969-1970 school year. Only one of the projects that was developed called for involvement of non-public school pupils. In this After School Tutorial Program, it was projected that "ten per cent of classroom seats would be held for non-public school children, in the event they wish to attend." Investigation revealed that no non-public school children took advantage of the opportunity to participate.

T. District 21

Only three non-public elementary schools in this district were certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs.

Twenty-four persons, including the principal of one of the eligible non-public schools, were involved in planning decentralized Title I programs in the district for the 1969-1970 school year. However, no project involving non-public school participation was organized, and investigation indicated that non-public school personnel or pupils were not involved in any of the projects under way in the district.

U. District 23

Three non-public elementary schools are certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. All three schools are listed in the request for funding that was submitted by the district.

Planning activities concerning the development of the district Title I program for the 1969-1970 school year are summarized in the request for funding. Review of this material indicates that representatives of the non-public schools, among others, were invited to submit proposals for programs, but there is no indication whether they did so, or whether they attended any of the planning sessions that were held after proposals were received.

Three of the programs organized by the district permitted participation of non-public school children. An Afternoon Study Center at Hunter Point was organized for pupils attending three public elementary school and one non-public elementary school in an isolated area in the district. Two Evening Guidance Clinics were also organized; both clinics were to accept children from the non-public schools. However, the Evening Guidance Clinic of P.S. 149Q did not service any pupils from eligible non-public schools; a number of pupils from non-public schools that were not on the approved list were serviced.

V. District 24

Only one non-public elementary school in this district was certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs. This school was listed in the request for funding submitted by the district.

Although representatives of the non-public schools were evidently involved in planning for the decentralized program in the district for the 1969-1970 school year, no details concerning the extent of their participation was given in the summary presented in the request for funding.

Participation of approximately 50 children attending the eligible non-public school in an After School Study Program was planned.

This program, which was to operate in two schools (P.S. 19 and P.S. 143Q), was designed to provide pupils with remedial help in the areas of reading and mathematics, to make available extra instruction in English for children learning English as a second language, to extend the use of the library beyond the normal school day, and to provide pupils with facilities to do their homework. Pupils were able to participate upon recommendation of a teacher, or at the request of a parent.

The program plan called for the enrollment of 225 children in grades Kg-3, with 50 to be drawn from Our Lady of Sorrows school. The Center was to be open from 3:15 to 5:15 P.M., three days per week. Ten licensed teachers were to be assigned to each center, with a supervisor at each center.

Actually, there were 40 applicants for the program from the non-public school. Only 20 of these children participated; by mid-year, this number had been markedly reduced, and by May, only 5 non-public school pupils were attending sessions at P.S. 143. (No non-public school pupils registered at P.S. 19; evidently, they were afraid that they would be molested if they attended.) The principal of Our Lady of Sorrows and most of the parents interviewed indicated that the children were withdrawn from the program because they felt that the atmosphere of the public school was too permissive.

In view of the small number of participants from non-public schools, this program was not considered to have been implemented.

W. District 27

Only one non-public elementary school was certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. This school was not listed as an eligible school in the request for funding submitted by the district. No representative of the non-public school participated in the planning sessions preceding the development of the district projects, and non-public school children did not participate in any of the programs that were organized.

X. District 28

Three non-public elementary schools in this district were certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs. All three of these schools were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district.

Representatives of the non-public schools participated in planning sessions concerned with the development of the district program. Thirteen such representatives were among the 34 persons who attended the first public meeting called to present information concerning the provisions of Title I. At three later working sessions described in the funding request, non-public school representation was considerably reduced - of the 18 persons present at one of these sessions, three represented non-public schools. At the second session, one non-public school representative was among the 20 persons present. There was no participation of non-public schools at the third session.

Three of the projects organized in the district permitted participation of non-public school children. Non-public school pupils were to be involved in an Enrichment Program at P.S. 40, in a Self-Motivation Institute at P.S. 50, and in a Cultural Trip Program.

The Self-Motivation Institute was designed to provide instruction in art, music, science, and creative drama to a maximum of 240 pupils. In addition, a number of trips were to be taken on Saturdays and during the week. As planned, the Institute was to meet from 3:00 to 5:00 P.M., three afternoons per week.

As implemented, the program served four groups of 20 children. Four eight week cycles were organized to cover the four subjects in which instruction was given. Twenty-seven openings were alloted to children attending St. Pius School; no other non-public school was invited to participate. Twelve children from the school attended the program during the first month; by mid-May, this number had dropped to two. If a child dropped out of the program, no attempt was made to recruit a replacement.

During the first two months of operation of the program, a volunteer from the non-public school accompanied the children to the public school in which the program was given. As soon as the volunteer withdrew, parents of the non-public school children refused to permit further participation. Although they expressed the feeling, in interviews with the evaluator, that the program had much to offer, they withdrew their children because they felt that the children would be molested.

In view of the marked attrition of non-public school pupils, no attempt was made to evaluate this program in depth.

The description of the Cultural Trip Program indicated that "non-public school children who are eligible for Title I services will be involved." Evidently, there was no attempt made to actualize such involvement.

Y. District 29

Only one non-public elementary school was certified as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. This school was not listed on the request for funding submitted by the district. There was no representative of the non-public schools at the planning sessions that preceded the adoption of the Title I program in the district, and pupils from the eligible non-public school were not involved in any of the projects that were undertaken.

Z. District 30

Six non-public elementary schools were designated as eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs in this district. All of these schools were listed in the request for funding submitted by the district.

Planning activities in relation to the district's Title I program were summarized in the request for funding. Six representatives of non-public schools were among the 26 persons who served as members of the Title I Education Advisory Committee, but no details are given concerning number of meetings held, or of attendance at each meeting.

Three of the programs (Breakfast Program, an Extended School Day, and a Guidance Program) that were organized in this district permit involvement of non-public school pupils. Only one of these programs, the Guidance Program, was implemented.

The Extended School Day Program proposed to meet the needs of disadvantaged pupils, a) who required "help in order to maintain themselves in their school work", b) who lived in "crowded small apartments and do not have a quiet area in which to study and do homework, c)"for whom library facilities are not available", d) or who have parents who "do not have the means to provide private lessons" in the arts, and e) who "need a supervised recreation program after school where they can relax and play in a safe and secure atmosphere."

Tutorial programs were set up in eight schools from 3:15 to 4:15, Monday and Thursday, staffed by 24 teachers, two speech teachers and eight supervisors.

In addition, an enrichment program was organized from 3:15 to 4:30 on the same days, staffed by 25 enrichment teachers for classes in art, music, and ceramics. Recreation centers were established in three schools from 3-5 on Tuesday and Friday and in two schools on Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday, employing nine recreation teachers and five teachers in charge. On Saturdays a recreation program functioned in four schools staffed by seven teachers and four teachers in charge. The library was opened two afternoons per week in all of the above schools; and was staffed by a teacher and a paraprofessional.

Twenty per cent of the children utilizing the extended school program were to come from the non-public schools. A caution that the "instruction program will not begin before 3:15 to allow time for students from non-public schools to arrive" was inserted in the project description in order to facilitate non-public school participation.

This program was adequately publicized and efficiently administered but the children from non-public schools did not attend. Out of 601 on register at the day programs only 9 were pupils of non-public schools; these nine attended a total of three centers. The principals of the non-public schools reported that parents felt that their children had had enough instruction by 3 o'clock and, in addition, the parents objected to children traveling to another school for the program and coming home when it was becoming dark outdoors. Parents and principals felt that after school programs should be conducted in the non-public school buildings which children attend during the regular school day.

The Breakfast Program was devised to solve a problem that was interfering with the education of children of disadvantaged families: the children were coming to school without an adequate breakfast. Many of the parents either did not have the funds to supply their children with an adequate breakfast to start the day's activities or were not aware of the importance of a nutritional breakfast for their children in preparing them for the school day.

The goals of the program were a) to provide an adequate breakfast for each disadvantaged child, b) to make the children aware of the foods that should be eaten, and c) to educate parents concerning proper diet for their children.

The program involved the serving of breakfast to 200 children, "10% of them from parochial schools", at P.S. 31R between 8:00 and 9:00 A.M. each morning. The dietician of the school ordered and completed the preparation of the food in the school; two paraprofessionals supervised the children; a teacher selected by the principal of P.S. 31R coordinated the program.

A visit to P.S. 31 indicated that the program was operating substantially as planned, except for the involvement of non-public school children. The kitchen was clean, and pleasant; the kitchen staff seemed competent; the dietician was concerned and efficient; the children in the cafeteria were eating a nutritious breakfast consisting of orange juice, dry cereal, egg, bread and milk. Seconds were served to those asking for them. Supervision by the aides was pleasant and friendly. The dietician indicated the food in the refrigerators to illustrate breakfasts were varied and were properly cared for after being received from a central source.

Publicity had been handled by the principal of the school - mimeographed announcements and application blanks had been sent in September to all schools, public and non-public. On October 15 a reminder was sent to all parents who had applied for the program. In November a report to parents went out and an invitation to the program since there was room for more children. In spite of the publicity, the average number of children in the program was about 120, 80 short of the goal. There were no children from non-public schools by March.

Originally about 15 had attended, but they had dropped out after a few weeks. The coordinator of the program ascribed this to the distance between the home and P.S. 31 and the distance from P.S. 31 to the child's home school. During the winter travel was difficult and time consuming, which meant that the non-public school children arrived late to their home schools.

The principals of three of the non-public schools closest to P.S. 31 confirmed the coordinators assessment. They submitted two recommendations to improve the situation and make it possible for their children to participate in a breakfast program: 1) have a breakfast program in the non-public school buildings or 2) provide bus transportation from home to P.S. 31R then to non-public schools.

AA. Districts 31, 32, and 33

None of the three demonstration districts organized decentralized Title I programs that involved non-public school pupils. Non-public schools actually located in these three demonstration districts were presumed, for purposes of participation in decentralized programs, to be located within the larger local school district from which the demonstration districts had been carved.

BB. Summary

A total of 170 non-public schools in New York City were designated as eligible for participation in district decentralized Title I programs. Of these, 117 (68.8%) were listed on the requests for funding submitted by the districts. It would appear that almost one-third of the non-public schools actually eligible for participation in decentralized Title I programs were overlooked in the preparation of proposals by the districts. In several districts, non-public schools that did not appear on the official list circulated by the central Board of Education were referred to as participating in district decentralized Title I projects, and follow-up revealed that pupils from these ineligible non-public schools had been involved in such programs.

Participation of non-public school personnel in planning of the decentralized Title I projects, and follow-up revealed that pupils from these ineligible non-public schools had been involved in such programs.

Participation of non-public school personnel in planning of the decentralized Title I programs in the districts was evidently minimal. While this generalization is based largely on a review of the account of planning activities summarized in project proposals submitted by the districts, interviews with non-public school personnel indicates relatively little involvement of other than public school personnel and representatives of community agencies in development of overall district programs.

Review of the requests for funding submitted by the districts reveals that five of the districts developed programs that did not call for any participation on the part of non-public school personnel or pupils. In one of these districts, funds were allocated from the decentralized Title I budget to provide additional personnel to non-public schools participating in centralized non-public school projects.

No projects involving non-public school pupils were organized in the three demonstration districts. Ostensibly, pupils attending non-public schools located in the geographical areas covered by the demonstration districts were to be included in the decentralized programs developed by those school districts from which the demonstration districts were abstracted.

Non-public school participation was specified in 68 (33.7%) of the 202 proposals submitted by the 26 districts that received funds for decentralized Title I programs (see Table 2). Interviews with program personnel and visits to sites of programs indicated that 33 of these projects that involved non-public school pupils as participants were implemented in whole or in part. In 35 instances, programs calling for non-public school participation, as described in the project proposal, were not implemented, at least insofar as non-public school involvement was concerned. This represents 51.5 per cent of the 68 projects organized by the districts that ostensibly made services available to non-public schools.

Table 2

Participation of Non-Public Schools in Decentralized Title I Programs, by District

District	Number of Projects Organized	Specified in Request for Funding	Participation of Non-Public Schools: Fully Implemented	Partially Implemented	Not Implemented
1	6	3	2		1
2	10	3		1	2
3	10	2	1	1	
4	8	1	1		
5	4	2	1		1
6	21	13		3	10
7	9	4	3		1
8	10	5	1		4
9	8	1	1		
10	3	2			2
12	9	3	1		2
13	9	1			1
14	16	10*	7		3
15	10	3	2		1
16	12	3	3		
17	2	1	1		
18	1	0			
19	5	0			
20	4	1			1
21	4	0			
23	9	3	1	1	1
24	1	1			1
27	3	0			
28	10	3	1		2
29	6	0			
30	4	3	1		2
31	4	0			
32	3	0			
33	1	0			
Total	202	68	27	6	35

*Includes one program not described in request for funding

CHAPTER IV

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

This chapter presents an analysis of the extent to which the decentralized Title I programs that were actually implemented succeeded in attaining their stated objectives. In view of the large number of projects that are involved, the discussion of each project must, of necessity, be relatively brief. In each instance, however, an attempt is made to present a concise description of each program, and an indication of its major strengths and weaknesses.

A. District 1

1. The STAR Program

The basic intent of the STAR program was to upgrade the child's reading skills by reaching out into their homes and providing parents with systematic techniques for tutoring their children. Regularly scheduled, weekly sessions were to be conducted in the homes of educational assistants.

In preparation for these coaching visits, the aides were to receive three hours of training each week by the professional staff assigned to the project. The aides were to be taught how to use a variety of educational materials and techniques that were to be incorporated into a series of structured lessons designed to supplement the beginning reading program of the school. The aides were to work five hours a day on a flexible schedule, under the supervision of the project coordinator, who was assisted by an auxiliary trainer.

The STAR program was designed to serve 375 first grade children drawn from five public and five non-public schools. The children were to be selected by their teachers. The basis for selection was teacher judgment -

those children whom they felt would be retarded at the end of the school year were to be considered eligible for the program.

In September 1969, letters were sent to the principals of all 13 public elementary schools and of five non-public elementary schools in the District, asking that first grade teachers complete a referral form for those first grade children whom she felt would not be reading on grade level by June 1970. It was suggested that she consult with the former kindergarten teacher before making a referral.

Each family of a referred child received a letter stating that their child had been selected for the program, and indicating that they would be visited by an aide who would discuss the program with them. No data are available concerning the number of such families that could not be reached or that refused permission for their child to participate.

The program was implemented as described. In all, a total of 362 children participated. Only 23 (6.4%), however, were enrolled in non-public schools.

Several approaches were utilized in evaluating the program's effectiveness with respect to non-public school participation. Interviews were conducted with the project coordinator, the auxiliary trainer, and several of the educational assistants assigned to the project. A number of parents and pupils participating in the project were also interviewed. In addition, questionnaires designed to ascertain reaction were sent to all parents and teachers of the 23 non-public school children enrolled in the program. Replies were received from 18 parents and 21 teachers.

Twelve (66.7%) of the parents expressed a favorable reaction to the program. They agreed that the school work of the child was better, that skills in reading had improved, that the child showed a more positive attitude toward school, and that participation in the program had been reflected in better conduct in school and at home. Eighteen (78.3%) of the teachers also indicated that the children had shown improvement in classroom work and behavior. Indeed, all of the teachers responding to the questionnaire felt that the child would be reading at or above grade level at the end of the school year. Some comments in the free response section of the questionnaires are typical of the reaction of the teachers: "I see a difference in the confidence of the child...and in the desire to learn." "They are happy to have the aide come to help." "I think the STAR program deserves much praise."

Although no standardized achievement test data were available in the non-public schools, the judgments of the classroom teacher provide ample evidence of the success of the program. However, some limitations were noted:

1. Some difficulties in communication were apparent. One non-public school indicated that ten pupils whose names were submitted for inclusion in the program were not accepted, although non-recommended pupils from the school were serviced.

2. A very small number of non-public school children were involved in the program. Greater participation may have been possible had public school involvement been restricted to five schools, as indicated in the project proposal. Permitting participation of all 13 public schools in the District may have limited the extent of non-public school involvement.

3. Less than one-fifth of the teachers of non-public school children reported any communication with or feedback from the staff of the STAR program.

2. The Homework Helper Program

The Homework Helper Program was designed to provide individual tutoring to 450 children selected on the basis of retardation in reading. The tutors were to be high school students who resided in the community, and who showed ability to relate to and to provide models of academic achievement and behavior for younger children. The program was to operate in six public schools on five afternoons per week. One of the weekly sessions was to be devoted to tutor training. The program was to be staffed by a project coordinator, an auxiliary trainer, 11 master teachers, 20 educational assistants, 10 part-time school secretaries, and one secretary. In addition, ten paid consultants, professional members of the community whom it was felt would help upgrade the paraprofessional personnel in the program, were employed.

The program was implemented as described in the project proposal. However, only five per cent of the children participating in the program were drawn from the non-public schools. Sixteen (11%) of the tutors attended non-public secondary schools.

While the number of participating non-public school pupils was small, evidently the participants did show progress. Responses to a questionnaire completed by all of the 24 classroom teachers of non-public pupils were very favorable; 18 (75%) of the teachers reported considerable growth in both school work and conduct that they attributed to the program. Many teachers also noted that the children needed and responded well to the individual attention that they received.

Approximately half of the non-public school pupils participating in the program were interviewed. All of the pupils were enthusiastic about the program. While different pupils singled out different aspects of the program as most valuable to them, they all agreed that the program helped them to get their homework done, and that they were receiving help in learning how to study.

The tutors were unanimous in their praise of the program. Not only did they feel that their students had shown progress, but they indicated that they, too, had been helped - to understand themselves, to appreciate the work of the teacher, to clarify their own vocational goals.

Here, too, the major limitation of the program, aside from the small enrollment of non-public school children, was the lack of contact between program personnel and the non-public school teacher after the initial referral was made. All but four of the non-public school teachers reported that there had been no feedback concerning pupil performance in the program.

B. District 2

1. Bilingual Program

A bilingual teacher was finally assigned to the non-public schools in the District late in April. The principals of the schools in which this teacher served report that her services were unsatisfactory, both in her command of Spanish and in her ability to communicate with people.

Bilingual paraprofessionals were assigned to two schools, again late in the school year. Here, too, the evaluation of the school principals was negative.

It would appear that, in part, the negative attitudes expressed by the representatives of the non-public schools to this program represents a general negative reaction to Title I programs in general. Evidently, there was considerable confusion in the District concerning decentralized and centralized Title I programs, and an almost total lack of communication. The attitude expressed by the District Superintendent of East Harlem Parochial Schools is typical: "our difficulty is not with the value of the program, but with overcoming interpreted regulations which hamper the program in private schools."

C. District 3

1. Pilot Schools in the Home

The following material is abstracted from the request for funding submitted by the District:

"This project will establish pilot schools in eight homes in the Chelsea area...It will be an opportunity for parents to explore the techniques of realizing the fullest potential of the home in applying the child's learning experiences in school. Insights will be gained into the methodologies and materials used in the classroom, enabling more effective "preparation" of the home environment and shared family activities for creative learning. The program will be centered around children in grades 1, 2, and 3 in order to act as a bridge between the home and the first years of school. A specific curriculum will be set up in each of the pilot schools in the home. It will vary, depending upon the needs of the participating families. Lessons will be planned in each of the subject areas with culminating activities in the form of bus trips on four Saturdays of the project's operation. The itinerary of these trips will include visits to such places as the Hudson Guild Farm, Sunken Meadow Park, etc."

"Programmed learning, workbook materials, classroom supplies and materials will be necessary. The testing materials requested will be used to diagnose needs and provide evaluative data. Library books will augment the ongoing program. Snacks will also be provided for the four bus trips."

"The project team will consist of one licensed teacher with experience in the area, onc clerk and four aides. It is anticipated that two homes can be visited each five hour day; one day each week would be utilized for on-the-job training of the paraprofessionals, planning and preparation of materials. A consultant would also be employed for seven sessions to act as a resource person for the teacher as well as the parents involved in the program. The program will involve 100 children including 10 from the non-public schools and will run from September 8th, 1969 to June 30th, 1970."

Through March and April, members of the evaluation team found it impossible to get information concerning the implementation of the program. All efforts to confer with the coordinator of the program, failed. After two months of evasion passed with no response to repeated telephone calls to her office, finally a meeting was arranged early in May.

Visits to two of the "pilot schools in the home" followed. In neither case was there any semblance of planning evident. Rather the evaluator observed a desultory visit with the family. There was a marked lack of any pattern of instruction or therapy. Requests for "a curriculum for each of the pilot schools in the home" mentioned in the grant application were refused on the ground of confidentiality; requests for perusal of records of visits and "planned lessons" were also refused, on the same grounds. When asked about diagnostic testing materials mentioned in the program description, the reply was that none were used. When a list of bus trips was asked for, the reply was that "the families have not chosen to participate in bus trips."

In short, those aspects of the program that were finally opened to inspection were of little value; the evaluator met with consistent evasion when an attempt was made to inspect other aspects of the program. One can only conclude that the coordinator of this program was determined that the program not be evaluated. It should be noted, in this connection, that appeals to the District 3 Title I Coordinator, and to the Office of the Assistant Superintendent to open this program to normal evaluation were unsuccessful.

On the basis of the information available to the evaluation team, the indications are that this program is of little value.

2. Guidance Program

"This program establishes a bilingual guidance team consisting of one guidance counselor, two family assistants, and two educational assistants. The major commitment of the team will be to the guidance program and activities of the participating schools."

"The project's guidance concern will be any problem that obstructs the child's ability to realize the fullest potential of his school experience. Acting upon administrative, guidance, and pedogogical referrals, the counselor and paraprofessionals working under his supervision will make home visits, visit social agencies, make referrals and assist in follow-up procedures. There will be a particular involvement in matters concerning school attendance. The guidance team will be assisted in their work with the children by utilizing library books, classroom supplies, textbooks, filmstrips and transparencies, and rented films. Other needed materials will be drawn from the requested supplies and materials."

"The project will operate from three non-public schools in the district, two days each at two of the schools and one day at the third school. The participating schools are:

Sacred Heart	1 day
St. Bernard	2 days
St. Columbus	2 days

The bilingual guidance team, drawing upon its bilingual and bi-cultural skills and insights, will be a major participant in all aspects of the guidance of the bilingual pupil."

The preceding was taken from the application for the grant. The actual program differed considerably from the projected one. Originally, the non-public schools' representative for the district requested a bilingual teaching program for the non-public schools in the district; what came out of the district office was a guidance program. In practice, the program became a bilingual tutoring program when implemented.

Originally a teacher in the district was assigned as coordinator of the program. From the beginning, he experienced difficulties in recruiting paraprofessionals and in obtaining essential equipment and supplies. By March, he had recruited two bilingual educational assistants but no family assistants. He ascribed this failure to the artificial and rigid requirements for certification of paraprofessionals. He had received only five per cent of equipment and supplies needed to operate the program, which had been ordered early in the fall. At this point he left the school system and the program. In this emergency, another teacher in the district, having the same qualifications: teaching experience, 16 credits in guidance, and Spanish speaking, assumed the position of coordinator.

She took over a program with two bilingual educational assistants and no supplies. The principals of the three non-public schools referred children from early grades who were experiencing difficulty because of lack of knowledge of English. The two assistants worked with small groups, two to four children for 45 minutes each week, in conversation, reading, or arithmetic, depending on the basis of referral. In addition, an effort is made to reduce the children's anxiety about their strange environment (they are mostly recent arrivals from Latin American areas).

The principals of the three non-public schools feel that the program was poorly organized and started too late in the year to show effects of the tutoring. They accept the change of focus of the program from guidance to instruction. They feel that the educational assistants are well qualified and are doing well under the circumstances; they recommend that in the future each assistant should be assigned five days a week to one school rather than one or two days as at present.

A sample of teachers who originally referred the children generally felt that there was an improvement in the children's performance in reading and arithmetic, but that it was slight, because of the shortness of the period during the actual operation of the program.

D. District 4

1. Assignment of Paraprofessionals

A total of 23 paraprofessionals were assigned to the nine eligible non-public schools in the District; one paraprofessional was assigned for each Title I teacher in a given school. As one would expect, the duties of the paraprofessionals differed in terms of the teacher to whom they were assigned; some of their duties, however, were common to all assignments.

The common functions that paraprofessionals performed were of a monitorial and clerical nature. These duties included: (1) escorting the children to and from the classroom; (2) keeping attendance records; (3) preparing and distributing rexographed stencils; (4) making notations on the pupils' progress book or chart; (5) assembling materials for individual sessions; (6) preparing, under the direction of the program teacher, reading materials, drill materials, ethnically oriented materials, etc.; (7) assisting in the distribution, collection and storage of instructional materials; (8) assisting teachers in keeping inventories; (9) arranging displays and bulletin boards; (10) telephoning a parent or helping to make some arrangements to assist in the program of a particular child; (11) assisting with housekeeping chores.

An evaluation of the paraprofessionals' performance of these activities was sought from the Title I personnel and the principals of the non-public schools; their judgments were generally favorable. Naturally there are varying degrees of qualitative performance based upon training, experience, skill, personality, and attitude. In the main, the overall judgment was that the level of performance of monitorial and clerical duties by the paraprofessionals was satisfactory.

The more specialized functions of the paraprofessionals' role varied according to the distinct job descriptions of the several Title I personnel. The paraprofessionals assigned to the corrective mathematics teacher assisted children in the use of mathematical materials, scored standardized mathematics tests and checked pupils' practice work for accuracy. The paraprofessionals assigned to the corrective reading teachers read stories to individual pupils and small groups, listened to stories read by pupils, conducted meaningful discussions during small group and individual reading sessions, led small groups of pupils in simple work games, led pupils in reading simple poems and riddles, and prepared simple dramatizations with pupils of stories read by pupils.

The paraprofessionals assigned to the guidance counselor assisted the counselor in the preparation of a community resource file. Where skills permitted, the paraprofessionals typed letters or stencils for parent workshops, and assisted in mailings from the Guidance office. Also, under the direction of the counselor, the paraprofessional worked with and observed individual children or small groups in a guidance oriented activity. This involved preparing a scrapbook, drawing or work with an educational game, etc.

An evaluation of the paraprofessionals' performance of the more specialized task was also sought from the Title I personnel and the non-public school principals. A few of the paraprofessionals were judged as doing very satisfactory work in these areas. In general, however, the overall rating of the performance in the more specialized areas was only fair. Every principal and Title I teacher indicated that the paraprofessionals needed more training. Optimally, they suggested that this training should come prior to the appointment to the job. Recognizing the difficulty of requiring pre-service training, there were strong suggestions for more in-service training.

E. District 5

1. Career Guidance for Disadvantaged Children

The stated goals of the program were "to help potentially able students in school, and to provide the support services which will encourage them to go on to college." The target population consisted of pupils in grades 7, 8, 9; 400 underprivileged children from four junior high and intermediate schools in District 5 and from the non-public schools that were eligible to participate. A comparatively large staff of full time and part time professionals and paraprofessionals (project director, four teachers, one social worker, two guidance counselors, one school psychologist, two educational assistants, five student aides, one senior clerk, one senior stenographer) were assigned to the project, which was located at the West Side YMCA at 63rd Street.

The coordinator of the project submitted, on request, a list of pupils referred to the project during 1969 and 1970. Investigation revealed that, of the eleven pupils referred, five never appeared for a preliminary interview while four were interviewed but did not return for counseling or tutoring. Of the two who attended, one showed slight progress in subject tutored and in vocational orientation and the other one showed good progress, as judged by the project staff.

Three non-public schools referred a total of eleven pupils for service; one school referred one pupil - this pupil was doing well and the principal felt the project was worthwhile, a second school referred two pupils - neither received service; the guidance counselor of the school felt that the project promised much more that it delivered.

The third school referred eight pupils; the principal of this school felt that the program was poorly organized and was better in public relations than in education.

This program involves so little non-public school participation one might well question whether it should be listed as a program for non-public school pupils.

2. Parent-Teacher Teams

This program was essentially one of providing educational assistants to serve in non-public schools in the district. As such, it paralleled that organized in District 4.

In District 5, from one to four Title I teachers were assigned in eight of the ten non-public schools (two non-public schools did not respond to a preliminary questionnaire, and would not permit an interviewer to visit the school). Twenty-one paraprofessionals were assigned to the Title I teachers in these eight schools.

In general, the duties of the educational assistants in these eight schools were identical to those described in the similar program organized in District 4. Evaluation of the performance of these paraprofessionals was also the same - the supervisors in the non-public schools, the Title I teachers, and members of the evaluation team all felt that performance of the more routine clerical and monitorial duties by the educational assistants was satisfactory, while performance of more specialized functions was generally only "fair". All of the supervisors and teachers indicated that the paraprofessionals needed more training. They all noted, too, that pre-service training would be the preferred approach.

F. District 6

1. Educational Assistants in Non-Public Schools

The project description of this program was unusually brief: "Educational Assistants in the Non-public schools will operate in ten non-public schools for five days each week from Monday through Friday, 9:00 - 3:00, starting November 10, 1969 and terminating June 30, 1970. Approximately 508 children in grades 1-4 will benefit from increased instructional services in the following schools:" (All ten eligible non-public schools in district 6 were then listed). "Personnel will consist of 15 educational assistants. This personnel will work under the direct supervision of licensed Board of Education teachers who have been assigned to the participating non-public schools under centralized programs. Fifteen educational assistants will each work for 147 five hour sessions. Educational assistants will enable the teachers to individualize classroom instruction by giving teacher directed small group instruction and by performing other instruction-related duties."

In actual practice, only fourteen educational assistants were assigned in five (not ten) schools; St. Charles (4), St. Mark's (4), St. Aloysius (3), St. Rose of Lima (2), Our Lady of Lourdes (1). Six of the educational assistants worked five days; four, 4 days; and four, 3½ days. The eight working less than five days a week were on loan to another district 6 decentralized program; the Educational Resource Center.

All paraprofessionals in this program attended regular training sessions at a central facility in P.S. 139M. Training sessions lasted three hours each, and each paraprofessional was programmed for twenty sessions during the span of the project. The training sessions were under the supervision of a licensed Early Childhood teacher and paraprofessional assistant.

Observation of a training session left the impression that the trainer was well prepared and respectful of her "pupils"; the assistant trainer was a valuable liaison between trainer and pupils. The topic of the day was mastery of papier mache construction by actual performance. The atmosphere was relaxed and cooperative; pupils paid close attention to the initial demonstrations, asked relevant questions, then proceeded with construction; they helped each other while the trainer and assistant trainer circulated to give encouragement and make suggestions.

In general, the supervisors of the non-public schools and the Title I teachers to whom paraprofessionals were assigned in District 6 evaluated the services of the educational assistants favorably. For the most part, ratings were higher here than in the case of similar programs in Districts 4 and 5. The respondents in District 6 reported that the educational assistants were well qualified, had adapted well to the atmosphere of the non-public schools, and had developed good relationships with pupils and teachers. They were particularly impressed by the assistance given by the paraprofessional in the individualization of instruction for the slow child.

2. Programmed Instruction for the Improvement of Reading Levels

This is "a program geared for pupils in grades 6, 7, 8 of I.S. 10. Operation of the project will take place between the hours of 3:00 and 5:00 P.M. four days a week (Monday through Thursday). Two hundred children will be serviced (one hundred eighty (180) from I.S. 10 and twenty (20) from Resurrection parochial school)."

"This program is designed to improve the reading skills, vocabulary, comprehension, word attack, dictionary skills and logical reasoning. The pupils will use workbooks and programmed phonics tape sets. Basic Reading skills will be taught and Language Arts activities will take place."

"Two trips are planned for the children."

Visits by the evaluator indicated that although the program had been in progress for some time, pupils from the non-public school began to participate only in mid-March. A communication in November was not sent to the right person and therefore the non-public school remained in ignorance of the existence of the program.

What could have been an insurmountable barrier to the functioning of the program was the delay in the arrival of materials which had been ordered early but arrived in mid-May. Fortunately, the coordinator was able to borrow supplies from the public school in which the program operated.

Observation of the program indicated some use of individualized instruction with tapes and earphones. While one group worked with machines, other groups worked with various other materials in other rooms.

An interview with the program coordinator revealed that the teachers and educational assistants were enthusiastic about the program, but that it was difficult to get educational assistants, especially men, because of the low pay.

He felt that the children enjoyed the program and had made considerable progress. Pre and post-testing with the Metropolitan test showed more than expected gains in reading skills on the part of public school pupils. However, due to the late entrance of the non-public school children into the program, comparable test results were not available. However, their attendance was good (although a few had dropped out), and those remaining in the program, according to staff members, showed satisfactory progress.

The principal and teacher of the non-public school, who were interviewed, indicated that the younger children enjoyed the program, although some of the older ones had dropped out. However, they were disappointed by the lack of communication between the program and the school and teacher. They felt they did not know what the children were doing or if the children were accomplishing anything. They could not, in view of the short time involved, really judge what progress their children had made.

3. The Educational Resource Center

The goal of the Educational Resource Center was to make library materials available to the children of all public and non-public elementary school children in District 6. The project involved ordering, processing, and circulating books, periodicals, reference materials, and audiovisual aids. Provision was to be made for circulation of all materials on a rotating basis from the site of the project at P.S. 92M.

The staff consisted of one full-time professional librarian, one full-time paraprofessional, and 6 paraprofessionals part time, on loan from another district program, Educational Assistants in Non-public Schools.

The materials, books, periodicals and visual aids had been catalogued and organized within a rather limited space of one classroom without shelving. Because the materials were slow in coming and sufficient assistance was lacking, actual circulation of materials started late.

All schools were invited to a conference to discuss what was available in the program, how to request materials, and how to use them. The degree of participation by public schools was much greater than that of non-public schools, according to the coordinator. She attributed this to the fact that the representatives of the public schools met regularly in monthly conference with the district supervisor of library and, in addition, the district supervisor regularly visited all the schools in the district.

Six non-public school principals who answered a questionnaire indicated that, in all cases but one, communication about the program was very limited; only one principal had full knowledge of the program because as archdiocesan representative in District 6 she attended district meetings. Of the other five, one never heard of the project, one attended a meeting but learned little because of disorganization, two others learned about it accidently late in the year, while one reported having been told that non-public schools were ineligible. The one school which made extensive use of the Center found the service good and the materials relevant to the school curriculum; all of the schools reported that such a program was much needed in their school.

Both the coordinator and the principal of St. Charles emphasized the need for facilities for transportation to deliver and pick up materials; the coordinator felt that in order to operate the program effeciently, more assistance and better facilities for orderly storage of the materials were needed. The representative of the archdiocese felt that provision for transportation was especially important for non-public schools because of their limited staff and ability to provide transportation for materials in such a program.

G. District 7

1. Educational Assistants in Non-Public Schools

This program, which assigned paraprofessionals to Title I teachers in non-public schools, was similar in every respect to comparable programs in Districts 4, 5, and 6. Again, evaluation of the performance of the paraprofessionals so assigned differed in terms of the nature of the work that was performed. In this instance, ratings of the execution of those duties that were considered clerical in nature were uniformly "very good", while those assigned to the more specialized aspects of assistance were only "fair". Again, it was felt that the paraprofessionals needed more training to develop increased competency in these more specialized work areas.

2. Trip Programs

Trip programs have been extensively evaluated in previous cycles of Title I funding grants; in general, the opinion of evaluators of such programs has been favorable. A similar favorable evaluation can be assigned to the current trip program in District 7.

All eleven non-public schools in the district participated in the program, taking trips to such centers as the United Nations, the Planetarium, the Museum of Natural History, Lincoln Center, Town Hall, the Botanical Gardens, and the Bronx Zoo.

In most schools, participation was at a maximum. Many of the schools availed themselves of the full quota of their possibilities for trips; in these schools, a majority of the pupils took one or more trips.

Student reaction, as usual, was overwhelmingly favorable, even enthusiastic, and pupil learnings, as reported by their teachers, were good. Again, the main fault to be found with this trip program, as with all others that have been evaluated in the past, was the minimal degree of integration of the trip program with the work of the class at the time the trip was offered. When such integration was possible, as in the case of groups of older pupils whose work in Social Studies concerning the UN coincided with a visit to that installation, the intense interest of the children was obvious and reflected in the searching questions they directed to their guides.

3. Community School Relations Weekend Conference

This Community Weekend Project had as its major aim the bringing about of greater communication between the school and the community. It was held at mid-year at Mahopac, New York in the Mahopac House. The number of participants ran in the hundreds; non-public official participants were represented by seven participants. It is the third year that this project has been funded and, as stated by the general aim, it is made up of representatives from both the schools, private and public, and representatives of various community endeavors in an effort to establish a better working rapport for the greater good of the community.

In an effort to establish this rapport, the participants wore name tags but without job descriptions, thereby to blur the line between school personnel and other phases of work in the community. An unstated and more subtle goal was to alleviate some of the community tensions that had been evident as a result of the teacher's strike of last year. There was an increased understanding of many of the mutual problems that are faced in common by the public, non-public and community personnel.

The Community Weekend opened on a Friday evening with an address by the District 7 Superintendent. This address emphasized the gain for all in a united effort on behalf of the children and the people in the community. The remainder of the first evening was left free for intergroup communication, in a sort of modified type of sensitivity group training.

Saturday morning was devoted to workshops developed along topical lines that would be of interest to the diverse community groups. Illustrative workshops included those that dealt with Narcotics Problem, Teacher-Parent Relationships, Resource Centers, etc. The afternoon of Saturday was divided between various panel discussions. Some of the discussions were paneled by young students from the area who stated their feelings about the schools and their contribution or lack of communication with the youth of today. Many additional members of the community proper came simply for this day, including the young people who were so effective in the panel discussions. Even though these additional community people were only in attendance for the day, they took a very spontaneous and fruitful part in the discussions and panels.

After supper on Saturday evening, the main participants were encouraged to relax and meet each other on an informal basis through a cocktail party and a nightclub performance. Many interpersonal and intergroup contacts were made during this evening, and the change of tempo was a welcome respite from the numerous workshops conducted during the day.

Sunday morning was devoted to ecumenical religious services, as well as to private religious services. After breakfast, there was a general summation of the entire weekend and a hope expressed that the spirit and rapport that had been established would extend into the community and would penetrate other aspects of community living in the future.

Interviews with participants in the weekend program provide an overview of the value of the Community Weekend Workshop:

(1) There was a better rapport between the schools in general and in specific phases of community work.

(2) The contacts made gave access to various agencies that could be called upon for help with specific problems, such as narcotics, guidance, etc.

(3) A better understanding of the problems in the public schools as well as those faced by the non-public schools.

(4) The subtle establishment of a feeling that much could be accomplished through united efforts.

H. District 8

1. After-School Reading Program, St. Athanasius

The after-school program at St. Athanasius School was initiated in the 1967-1968 school year, and continued at that location for two years. It originally included an arithmetic remediation and a physical education component.

Due to the fact that responsibility for the building could not be assumed by the incoming Title I teachers, the entire program was shifted to a Catholic Community Center, Casita Maria, where it was held during the past school year 1969-1970. It also changed direction, dropping the section of time allotted for physical education, and due to other circumstances, eliminating the Arithmetic portion of the program, eventually placing the complete emphasis upon Reading.

The Reading Program was conducted from 3:30 to 5:30 on Tuesdays and Thursdays and was held at Casita Maria. In the beginning months the teachers consisted of a Reading teacher, and a Math teacher, who due to an accident withdrew almost immediately from the program. A second teacher, came as a replacement but was also a Reading teacher, thus the Arithmetic aspect of the program disappeared. There were, in addition, two educational assistants who participated in the program.

There were 30 children who attended the program on a regular basis. These were students of the 3rd, 4th and 5th grade levels. From an ethnic point of view the children were representative of the general area and were for the most part Puerto Rican youngsters. The program was regularly supervised by the District supervisor.

The teachers used a variety of remedial techniques and methods with the 30 students divided into groups for more efficient results. The two paraprofessionals continued exercises as directed by the teachers. The children were grouped on the basis of ability levels, and encouraged to progress at their own rate. Both teachers were very creative, particularly in development of materials; both had excellent rapport with the children, and their own enthusiasm for the program was reflected in the interest shown by the pupils. Pupil progress was good; a comparison of pupils participating in the program with a group of non-participants showed a higher rate of progress for the former. Teachers, too, reported a much higher degree of interest in school achievement and general interest on the part of program participants.

I. District 9

1. Bilingual Program

The Bilingual Program in District 9 was initially designed to include two non-public schools, Our Lady of Victory and St. Augustine. The Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam School for Girls was included in the program in February of 1970.

Each school was to have been provided with a team of three, consisting of a bilingual teacher, a family assistant, and an educational assistant. The team was to assist in the guidance process, particularly for those children who were newly arrived in this country. They were also to work as resource agents for the parents, children, school and other interested parties. The teachers were to work a full daily schedule, while the educational assistants were to work five hours a day, five days per week. The family assistants were to have a flexible schedule but were required to maintain a log of all interviews, conferences and activities on daily and hourly basis. In conjunction with the teachers and educational assistants they were to have individual conferences with parents (both in school and in the parents' homes), conduct workshops, and perform other out of class services to children, such as escorting them home.

The team of three was to be under the direct supervision of the Title I office in conjunction with the designated head of each of the non-public schools. The acting supervisor of Bilingual Education in the district was to assist in the training and supervision of this program.

Each school interpreted this program differently and therefore no two programs were alike.

Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam

The program started during the third week in February. The principal felt his greatest need was for a remedial math teacher who was bilingual and therefore the program functioned as a remedial math program. The teacher worked with two to four children at a time and taught in both English and Hebrew. There was no educational assistant or family assistant present because the principal did not feel they would be useful in this program.

All equipment and facilities for this program were provided by the school.

Our Lady of Victory

In this school the program functioned primarily as a link between the school and the community. The family worker escorted children home when necessary, had conferences with parents at home and in school, both individually and in groups, and tried to organize parent workshops. The teacher, who was assigned to the school in February, taught reading to small groups, coordinated the school's Puerto Rican Culture program, and served as a general guidance counselor. The educational assistant assisted the principal with clerical work, but also worked with the team and helped individual teachers with problem children. All members of the team were bilingual.

All materials and equipment were provided by the school. There were not enough rooms and therefore the team was located in the teachers' room.

St. Augustine

The teacher and family assistant in this school functioned as a guidance team. They met with individual children who were having difficulty in school, individual parents, and groups of parents, and they conducted parent workshops. In addition to being responsible for the guidance function of the school, they also served as resource people for all activities involving Puerto Rican or Spanish culture.

The educational assistant was not bilingual and did not function with the team. She served as an educational assistant in a first grade class.

The family assistant and the bilingual teacher did not start working until February. The educational assistant worked in the school last year on another program and was transferred to this one in September.

In general, the program showed a high degree of success. The teams in each school developed a good relationship with the school staff, and were felt to be performing a worthwhile service by the teachers and administrators of the three non-public schools. At the Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam school, the individualized program developed for the pupils was enthusiastically received by the pupils and children, and was reflected in greater growth in mathematics, as reported by the teachers. In Our Lady of Victory, too, the children reacted very favorably to the bilingual instruction. Perhaps more important, children were given an opportunity to work out problems with an understanding adult, and parents were helped with personal problems, as well as school problems involving their children. Moreover, the team made an excellent contribution to the school general program of Spanish culture. At St. Augustine, highly successful workshops, where parent attendance was excellent, were organized.

It should be noted that the programs took different forms in the several schools. While this is looked upon as one of the strengths of the program, the variety noted meant that the guidelines of the program were not adhered to, although the program as organized in each school was considered of high value. In particular, greater pre-planning is evidently necessary.

J. District 12

1. Program for Teaching English as a Second Language

This program provided for the assignment of one bilingual teacher and a family assistant in each of the following non-public schools: (1) St. John Chrysostom, (2) St. Anthony of Padua, and (3) St. Thomas Aquinas. The activities undertaken by the personnel assigned were supervised by the district Bilingual Coordinator. The major functions of the bilingual teachers were to service children whose difficulties with the English language affected their performance in school, to actively involve parents and the community in the functions of the school, and to assist in the orientation and guidance of non-English speaking children and parents. Among the duties of the bilingual teachers, as stated in the project proposal, were the following:

a. Administer appropriate educational tests to children
b. Assist the classroom teacher in preparing relevant teaching materials
c. Assist in school sponsored student organization activities
d. Organize parent workshops
e. Assist in identification of bright and handicapped pupils, and to help plan appropriate programs for them
f. Assist in orientation of newly-assigned school personnel and to serve as a resource for other staff members with respect to the language, history, and customs of the pupils
g. Serve as a resource person for the Parents' Association and maintain contact with community persons and agencies related to servicing children

h. Make home visits to help in guidance of pupils and parents

As one would expect, the activities of the personnel assigned were somewhat different in the three schools:

a. St. Thomas Aquinas. The bilingual teacher in this school taught classes in Spanish culture to sixth, seventh, and eighth grade pupils during their study period; the children received approximately one period per week of such instruction. She also taught Spanish to second and third grade classes for two one-half hours of instruction per week. These classes enrolled many children of Puerto Rican background who lacked a basic knowledge of Spanish. In addition, she conducted "Reading Hours" for first, second, and third grade children in which they were introduced to books emphasizing Hispanic culture. She also organized Spanish classes for teachers; attendance in this class, however, dwindled after a time.

The bilingual teacher in this school took on many responsibilities in the guidance area: she conducted individual and group interviews with children having difficulties at school or at home; she conferred with parents and with teachers concerning problems of individual children; she arranged meetings between parents, the guidance counselor and the social worker to facilitate referral of children with severe emotional problems; she helped organize a career day conference for seventh and eighth grade pupils; she arranged adult education classes for parents.

The family assistant served as an assistant teacher in the Spanish and Hispanic culture classes.

b. St. John Chrysostom. In this school, the teaching activities of the bilingual teacher were limited to giving individual help to children in need of remedial reading. She also organized a Library Club, in which instruction was given to children in the primary grades on how to use the library, and stories were read. The bilingual teacher conferred with children having academic difficulties; where indicated, children were referred for help in reading and mathematics, or to the guidance counselor or social worker.

A considerable amount of time was given to work with parents. The bilingual teacher held conferences with the parents about the progress of their children, housing difficulties, and family problems. She organized an English Workshop for non-English speaking parents and conducted a sewing workshop for parents. These groups met once per week. She also formed a Mother's Committee to help serve lunch at school. In addition, she made visits to homes.

The family assistant helped in all aspects of this work.

c. St. Anthony of Padua. The bilingual assistant in this school conducted classes in Conversational Spanish and Spanish Culture for eighth grade students, and taught reading to a small group of second grade non-readers. She also conducted classes in Fine Arts one afternoon per week. A Sewing Workshop for parents, conducted every day, provided an opportunity for informal teaching of Basic English.

The bilingual teacher also held conferences with children and parents and established contacts with community agencies.

The educational assistant was the mother of two children who were pupils in the school and was very familiar with the community. She made most of the home visits that were undertaken.

Although the activities undertaken varied in the several schools, it was possible to identify characteristic strengths that applied to the program as a whole:

a. The Bilingual Program served as a means of placing Spanish-speaking individuals in roles in which they could serve as models for Spanish-speaking pupils.

b. The bilingual teachers served as a bridge between the school and the community. As a result of the counseling and guidance provided by the bilingual personnel, Spanish-speaking parents learned that the school was concerned about them and their children.

c. The relatively small number of children who received individual help in reading made considerable progress.

d. A number of children were introduced to the study of Spanish and of Hispanic Culture.

e. Parent workshops proved to be an excellent device for developing parent interest.

f. Program personnel made a worthwhile contribution to the guidance programs in the schools. The home visits, while few in number, were particularly valuable.

g. Library and story-telling sessions were important means of building pupil interest in language arts activities.

The program, however, was not free of weaknesses:

a. The stated objectives of the program were much too ambitious for the small number of personnel involved. As a consequence, many of the activities, specified as appropriate tasks for the bilingual personnel, were never attempted.

b. The program reached only a very small proportion of the pupils and parents who were in need of help.

c. The budget provided for purchase of materials was much too small. In particular, funds for parent workshops were very inadequate.

d. Contact with community agencies tended to be miniscule.

e. Little provision was made for on-the-job training of program personnel.

f. Office facilities were totally inadequate.

g. There was some danger that the program, geared to the needs of the Spanish-speaking members of the schools, served to alienate other ethnic or language groups within the community.

h. Not enough attention was given to orienting the schools to the role of the bilingual personnel. Too many school staff members looked upon the bilingual team as mere translators.

K. District 14

1. Operation Music School

Operation Music School was a recycling of a Title I program that operated during the 1968-69 academic year as an after-school program and also during the summer months. During the 1969-70 academic year it was carried out in four centers: I.S. 49, J.H.S. 50, P.S. 59, and J.H.S. 126, from October through June for a total of 90 sessions.

The purpose of the project was to provide a cultural experience in music through active participation. Children were given an opportunity to start or continue their musical training. All pupils from both public and non-public schools were eligible to participate in the program. Students in the district between the ages of 9 through 17 were able to choose from among the following groups: beginning or intermediate guitar, clarinet, trumpet, violin, or voice. In addition, a district band was conducted at J.H.S. 50 on Saturdays and included participants from various schools in the district.

The staff of the program consisted of the following personnel:

(1) A Coordinator who was responsible for the overall supervision of

the program. He hired all personnel within the contract guidelines, established registration procedures, and supervised distribution of instruments and placement of students.

(2) Four General Assistants who supervised each of the four Music Centers and were responsible for maintenance of the program, supervision of personnel, building security, and maintenance of records and reports.

(3) Five secretaries who were responsible for preparation of stencils, mimeograph runoff, typing of reports, and preparation of payrolls.

(4) Eight Teachers of Music who were responsible for conducting lessons in the various musical instruments available to the program.

(5) Sixteen Educational Assistants who assisted the classroom teacher in helping the students learn the various instruments and in providing as much individualized instruction as possible.

(6) Eight Student Aides, local in-school high school students, who were to assist the classroom teacher in lowering the student-teacher ratio and also to provide a model for the students to identify with.

(7) Eight School Aides who were to provide building security and assist in setting up and dismounting equipment at the start and the end of each day's session, and to assist in the distribution of snacks.

Of the students participating in the program two-thirds were from the elementary schools in the district and one-third from the junior high schools. The total number of students registered in the program was 472. Of these, 164 (34.7%) were from parochial schools. The total number of students from parochial schools in the district who actually attended sessions was 86 (52.4%). Fifteen to twenty per cent of the 238 students who attended the sessions this year also participated in last year's program.

Overall attendance was poor. Generally there were about six to twelve pupils receiving instruction in any one hour period. An analysis of the records indicates the following register and average attendance at each center:

School	Register	Average Attendance	Per Cent
I.S. 49	105	76	72.4
J.H.S. 50	186	48	25.8
P.S. 59	132	73	55.3
J.H.S. 126	49	41	83.7
Total	472	238	50.4

In general, classes were carried out informally, especially in the vocal and guitar groups. The teacher usually worked with the group while an assistant assisted an individual pupil who needed extra help or had been absent for a while.

Pupils learned notation as they learned to play their instruments. Each student had an instrument to use while he attended the session.

Students worked in groups of from 6 to 12, each pupil being provided an instrument. For the first hour, the teacher worked with elementary students; for the second hour, with Junior High pupils and, in some cases, Senior High pupils. It was evident that the grouping of students for instruction at each center was flexible and was based on the number of students and their level of ability. Instruction was provided for both beginners and intermediates, generally the first and second hours, respectively. Opportunities for individualizing instruction were plentiful since each teacher was assigned two educational assistants, one student aide, and one school aide.

Although pupils receiving instruction in a particular instrument were divided into two groups and instructed concurrently, no problems were perceived. However, at some centers, depending on the number of pupils in attendance, children were permitted to attend both group sessions and on occasion problems arose as to the number of instruments available.

Students, teachers, and assistants appeared to be enthusiastic and interested. Pupils were proud to perform for the observers and any visitors. In general, those students who attended regularly, usually for one hour, three times a week, were most interested and demonstrated the greatest proficiency. It was found that the better students were those who were members of their school band or a musical group in their own school. In such instances, Operation Music School served as a supplement to their instruction.

Each center presented a culminating performance during the last week of May. Student participation in the culminating performances was rather low. Approximately twenty students took part in the musical program presented at each center. The audience consisted of parents, some of the teacher assistants and aides, the supervisor of the center and the coordinator of Operation Music School. Parent involvement was high in all but one center, where no parents were present.

The quality of pupils' performances was rather high. Many had not studied music before and were able to read notes and keep rhythm. They were visibly proud of their accomplishments and happy to demonstrate their abilities. Parents were also very pleased. Soloists generally were students who were also part of their school band or music group and for whom Operation Music School was a supplement to their training. In the center where guitar and voice were taught as the instruments offered, the pupils who played the guitar also sang. They were coached by the vocal instructor.

In spite of the enthusiasm expressed by pupils and parents, it was apparent that there was a lack of incentive on the part of the pupils. What the program actually offered students was the opportunity to receive two one hour instruction periods weekly. There was no provision made for practicing what was learned or for demonstrating or "showing off" to parents or friends. These instructional periods were isolated moments in the pupils' week with no carry over into their lives outside the center. Pupils did not own instruments and no provision was made for renting them or for borrowing them from the center. Therefore, there was no continuity of instruction and little motivation for children to learn to play an instrument. This seemed to be the underlying cause of poor attendance and the large number of dropouts.

Operation Music School provided excellent opportunities for students to participate in a meaningful and interesting activity, which opened up new avenues of interest to them, and which provided a means for communicating feelings and ideas through a non-verbal means. This program allowed for the discovery and development of musical talent that otherwise might have gone unnoticed. Already, three students have been offered scholarships from music associations. This will allow them to pursue their study in depth.

Children involved in this program have developed a feeling of pride in themselves, have gained added self confidence, and have shared a common interest with other children. This was most clearly evidenced in the culminating performances.

2. Out of School Study Club

The School Settlement House, sometimes known as the Jackson Street Settlement House, is located in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn. The settlement house itself is old and shabby, but it seems to provide the informality and warmth which is often lacking in modern school settings. The second floor, used for the Out of School Study Club (hereafter called the Study Club), is divided into several small rooms which in no respect resemble a school or institutional atmosphere.

The settlement house has provided space, free of charge, for the Study Club. The primary purpose of the Study Club was to provide tutoring by capable high school students to assist elementary school pupils to improve their skills in reading and/or mathematics. Its secondary purpose was to furnish a non-school sociable setting where children may come to do their homework and to have it checked for accuracy. The tutors, for the most part, were high school students who are paid from ESEA funds.

Attendance by the children was entirely voluntary. Most of them came to the Study Club because a friend told them about it or because they were already making use of the facilities of the settlement house and discovered the study project for themselves.

The center was open five afternoons a week from three o'clock until half past six. The children were each scheduled for two half-hour sessions per week with the student tutors. Many stayed all afternoon, enjoying the attention and sociability the club affords. Some children elected to come several days a week to do their homework and have it corrected. There were a few who came regularly five days a week.

Two public school teachers were assigned as directors of the project and ten student tutors. The two teachers radiated friendliness and informality, making each child feel that they were glad he was there. The tutors picked up this feeling and took a real interest in each child, his problems and his achievements.

Children entering the program were tested in reading and/or mathematics by one of the directors who planned appropriate work for the pupil and carefully supervised the teaching by the tutors. Both directors shared in overall administration, procurement of books and supplies, record keeping, and relations with parents and with the settlement house staff.

The pupils enrolled in the Study Club came from four public elementary schools and three parochial schools, plus one pupil from a public high school. (He had also attended the previous year when he was in elementary school.)

There were 98 pupils on the register of the Study Club in September, 1969. The present study is limited to these children and does not concern itself with those who enrolled later in the year.

Of these 98 pupils, 40 attended public schools and 58 came from parochial schools. Forty-three were boys, and 55 were girls.

The 98 children on register in September, 1969 included 26 black and 12 Puerto Rican children. The remainder were of Italian descent. This distribution parallels the ethnic composition of the neighborhood. The assistant director of the settlement staff, interviewed at the Open House for parents, stated that many of the children were the third generation of families which had lived in the neighborhood, often in the same house, since the grandparents first came to the United States. The parents viewed education, both formal and informal, as a foundation for economic upward mobility.

There were a number of children who had attended the Study Club for more than one year. Seven returned in September, 1969 for a third year, and 21 came for a second year. The remainder were new to the project in the 1969-70 year.

The greatest number of children came from grades 2, 3, 4, and 5. Although the program had been planned to include high school dropouts, none of them presented themselves for admission. This was basically an elementary school project.

Using whatever reading scores were available, the evaluator estimated the children's reading level as follows:

Reading Grade Level	Boys	Girls	Totals
More than one year above grade level	1	1	2
Two to nine months above grade level	11	3	14
At or near grade level	1	7	8
Two to nine months below grade level	10	27	37
More than one year below grade level, but less than two	13	16	29
Two or more years below grade level	7	1	8
Totals	43	55	98

Of the 98 pupils on the September register, 37 were slightly below grade level in reading; 29 were more than one year below; and 8 were seriously retarded. Only 24 pupils were at or above grade level.

A relaxed and friendly atmosphere was one of the salient features of the Study Club. The interest shown by the teachers and the tutors in the individual child has already been mentioned. Equally indicative of the success of the program in achieving this goal were the comments of the children who were interviewed. Typical statements included:

"I love the settlement house."

"It's fun. I like it here."

Interviews with parents also attest to the success of the program in this regard. Some of the comments made by parents stressed this feature of the Study Club. In referring to their children, typical statements included:

"She loves to come - would come every day if I would let her."

"They come to see the tutors, even if they have no homework."

"She is shy. The Study Club is good for homework, encouragement, and mingling."

The holding power of the program may also be looked upon as evidence of its success in this area. Attendance was good. Forty-eight children were rated Excellent in attendance (rarely a day missed); 15 had a Good (steady attendance with some absences); and 35 came irregularly or dropped out of the program. Other pupils, not included in these figures, enrolled at various times up to and including March, 1970, and generally maintained a good attendance record.

The number of children who attended for more than one year, and the number who came more than the scheduled two afternoons a week, also attest to the success of the program.

To what extent did the program succeed in improving the reading and math levels of pupils? Two approaches were utilized in seeking an answer to this question: (a) a questionnaire was sent to the classroom teachers of the participating children; and (b) an attempt was made to determine the growth of participating pupils as evidenced by scores on standardized tests.

Teacher questionnaires relating to 44 children in the program were returned.

Analysis of these responses and of the interviews conducted in one school with teachers indicated the following:

1. Teachers of 24 children believed that their school work had benefited. Teachers of 20 children did not see any improvement resulting from the Study Club.

2. Teachers of 16 children reported an improvement in homework, whereas 28 saw no change.

Among the teachers' comments were the following:

> "She is more independent and because of the Study Club she was able to attend the high school of her choice."
>
> "I believe the tutoring program is just great for these children."
>
> "She has done well in reading and mathematics. Her comprehension has picked up."

It was not possible to determine the amount of gain in standardized test scores for many of the children. Many ratings were missing from the permanent record cards in the schools, possibly the result of absence on testing days. The parochial schools did not administer the same tests as the public schools.

However, some of the available scores proved to be quite startling. Among the boys, one moved from a reading level of 3.5 on the fall test to 5.2 in the spring retest. Another boy advanced from 4.4 to 5.6. Among the girls, one began at pre-readiness level and raised her score to 2.4 in the spring. Other girls increased their scores from 5.1 to 6.6; and from 7.4 to 8.5. These were children who seemed highly motivated and whose attendance at the Study Club was almost perfect.

Although no formal program of parent involvement, other than an Open House, was organized, it was evident, from interviews with parents, that they were cognizant of the work of the Study Club. Typically, the parents were concerned about their children. Some mothers were worried about poor marks; others wanted their children to "do better." Some wanted their children to be prepared for the diocesan high school entrance examinations.

Among the parents' comments in the course of interviews were the following:

"She is one grade behind in reading. She needs help before she slips further back."

"He was left back once and needs help."

The interviews conducted with teachers at the public and parochial schools also were indicative of parent reactions to the program:

"Her mother has spoken about the program and believes that it has helped with her school work."

"Yes, the parents feel the extra tutoring has done the child good in all areas."

"Several parents have expressed the hope that the Study Club will be continued next year."

A petition to the local school board requesting continuation of the Out-of-School Study Club was circulated in May, 1970. More than four hundred parents signed it.

It is very evident that the parents were appreciative of the work of the Study Club.

In general, it is evident that the program achieved a high measure of success. The number of children returning for a second or third year, the number attending nearly every session, the number coming more than the scheduled number of sessions per week, were all indicative of the feeling of the children that the program was meeting their needs. The desire for successful achievement, expressed so often in interviews with the children, reflected the motivation engendered by the program. The reports of the parents and, to a somewhat lesser degree, of the teachers, were also indicative of the improvement associated with attendance at the Study Club. It is also important, in evaluating the success of the program, to consider the approval voiced by the community, as evidenced in the request for its continuation for the coming year.

Many factors evidently contributed to the high degree of success that was achieved: the location of the Club in a non-school setting, the interest and cooperation of the settlement house staff, the attitude and ability of the two directors, the dedication and calibre of the high school students who served as tutors, and the ample number and variety of materials available. The appreciative and supportive role of the parents was also an important factor making for the success of the program.

3. Homework Helper in Hebrew Day Schools

The Homework Helper Program (HHP) was operated in five Yeshivas within District 14. This Program was an extension of a project which had functioned in all of the District's 28 public schools, one store front installation and one Yeshiva, during the 1968-1969 school year.

Because of its success the HHP was expanded to include seven Yeshivas in the Williamsburgh section of Brooklyn. Each of the Yeshivas was budgeted for one master teacher and ten tutors who were to service twenty children per week. One group of ten students was to meet with its tutors on Mondays and Wednesdays, while a second group of ten students was to meet with its tutors on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

Pupils were selected for participation in the Program by their regular Hebrew day school teachers and supervisors. Only children in the third grade or above were eligible for entry into the HHP.

The objectives of the HHP were:

1. To provide individual assistance to pupils in need of help in English and Mathematics
2. to motivate high school students toward improved academic achievement by utilizing them as tutors
3. To provide models for educationally deprived children in the hope of increasing their aspirations
4. To expose high school and college students to a tutorial experience while they are still young enough to choose teaching as a career.

Although the Program called for seven HHP Centers to function in the Hebrew day schools, only five centers were operative. The two centers that did not participate in the HHP cited their inability to find the type of tutors they desired to work with their students and a reluctance to become involved with a public school sponsored program, as reasons for this non-involvement.

Of the five centers that did operate, one became functional in early March. This late start was attributed to difficulties in hiring the necessary tutors. A second center terminated its program in early May, because the tutors had commitments elsewhere.

The HHP functioned Mondays through Thursdays from 3:30 P.M. to 5:30 P.M. with an additional two hours per week added on these sessions for tutor training. This condensing of five sessions into four sessions was necessary because the Yeshivas close Fridays at 3:15 P.M. for religious reasons.

The HHP Coordinator was instrumental in working with Hassidic leaders of the Community to solidify support for the Program. In addition to selecting the master teachers, she also established the operational plans for the Program, and was responsible for its overall day to day supervision and administration.

Two field assistants aided the HHP Coordinator in the day to day supervision of the Program in the five Yeshivas and the other 28 HHP centers in District 14.

Master teachers in each Yeshiva were responsible for the day to day operation of the Program. They supervised the tutoring sessions, provided orientation for tutors and completed monthly anecdotal logs. The master teachers were licensed New York City teachers.

Few of the Yeshivas in the HHP had a full complement of tutors. Listed below are the five Yeshivas with the number of tutors employed and the number of children serviced. It must be remembered that the number of tutors was subject to some degree of fluctuation. The number of tutors cited here indicate accurate figures for April and May.

1. Beth Jacob High School for Girls - 9 tutors - 18 children
2. Yeshiva Kehilath Yaakov - 7 tutors - 11 children
3. Yeshiva Arugath Habosem - 10 tutors - 20 children
4. Bais Yaakov D'Khal Adas Yereim for Girls - 8 tutors - 16 children
5. Yeshiva Jesode Hatorah V'Etz - 8 tutors - 16 children

The tutors at these five Yeshivas consisted of high school students, college students, and one licensed New York City teacher. They were employed by the HHP Coordinator and brought varied backgrounds to the Program. For instance, some tutors attended public schools while others attended the non-public Hassidic schools.

Working under the direction of the master teacher, the tutors provided individual assistance to pupils in need of basic educational skills. Tutorial activities included giving pupils help in reading, mathematics, speaking English, creative writing, homework study skills and proper work habits. The tutors utilized SRA Laboratories and Cyclo-Teacher Kits, as well as two more traditional reading workbooks, in the effort to succeed in the above activities.

Tutors were also expected to submit anecdotal reports to the master teacher, detailing what was taught to each child in each session, and noting what special needs of the child were yet to be met. The tutors were paid from $1.50 to $2.25 per hour, depending on their educational background.

An individual folder was maintained for each student in the Program, detailing his academic deficiencies and subsequent progress, if any. Daily anecdotal reports, completed by the tutors, for each child, were placed in those folders.

In the course of several visits to each of the Yeshivas, the evaluators found that student and tutor attendance averaged approximately 90 per cent. The most pertinent comment on this attendance record was made by a student, who during an interview stated: "I love to come here, because here I learn."

All of the Yeshivas placed great emphasis on reading. It was quite evident, from interviews with the students that most of them had severe problems both in reading and in the speaking of English. The one to one tutor-pupil ratio facilitated the development of good rapport, vital for the occurrence of effective teaching. In some instances, tutoring seemed to be hampered by an inadequate supply of materials. Physical facilities left much to be desired. The Yeshivas, for the most part, were located in old buildings and, due to the shortage of space, the tutors and the children all met in one room. Despite this apparent drawback, everyone associated with the Program was very enthusiastic over the academic improvement of children involved in the Program.

Interviews with four of the five Yeshiva principals and eleven Yeshiva teachers revealed that all were quite pleased about the existence of the Program. In addition, they were unanimous in the view that there had been tremendous improvement in the children's work in English studies. One principal remarked that: "The Homework Helper Program has had a remarkable effect on the academic accomplishments of the children." Another positive factor, illustrating the success of the Program, were the constant requests made by parents to enroll their children in the Program. The Yeshiva principals were quite aware of the inadequate physical plant facilities, but held out little hope for improving this situation in the immediate future.

Discussions with 31 children revealed a significant degree of enthusiasm for the Program. Almost all the children interviewed told the evaluators that they would enroll in the Program next year and would tell their friends to do likewise. Among the most frequently mentioned reasons for these positive feelings were the following: (1) the feeling that they were doing better in their English studies and mathematics; (2) the cookies and orange drink that were served daily; (3) the excellent relationship established with their tutors.

The program has accomplished a great deal in securing the cooperation of the Hassidic community, yet much more remains to be done in the sensitive area of relationships between the Hassidic community and a secular institution, as represented by the public schools and its personnel.

The valiant efforts of the HHP Coordinator in this area merits continuation.

4. Young Audiences

This program was designed to provide each of twenty schools with "a complete program of live music, commentary and audience participation" three times from September to June.

In November the District Music Coordinator forwarded a letter to the principals of the public and non-public schools indicating that Title I (ESEA) District 14 funds were to be used in co-sponsoring concerts with the New York Committee of Young Audiences. He stated that since Title I provided funds for both public and non-public school students, each public school should invite a neighboring non-public school. The number of classes to be invited was to be dependent on the number of fourth graders in the respective public school, as excess seats were to be allotted to non-public schools.

Specific invitations to the individual non-public schools were considered a responsibility of the principals of the public schools. Letters were to be sent notifying the non-public schools of concert dates and numbers of non-public school students for whom space was available.

A survey was made of the twelve non-public schools in District 14 eligible for Title I funds. Two had not heard of the program at all, one had been notified only by the non-public school representative, three had been invited to participate only once, while the remainder had participated two or three times.

Members of the evaluation team attended three of the performances that were given. It was evident that pupil response was enthusiastic.

It was equally clear that the programs, although well-conceived and well-conducted, were somewhat above the ability level of the children. Moreover, it was doubtful that a single demonstration, as presented by the performers, was sufficient to have any lasting beneficial educational results.

Fourth grade children would normally fail to develop permanent learnings unless they were well prepared prior to the performance, and the material reviewed after the performance. This was confirmed by the teachers who were interviewed; many of them suggested that notification concerning the programs and their content should be available to the schools well in advance of the performance, so that they might prepare their students.

Principals were interviewed in all the schools concerned. All felt that the program was excellent. They thought that the number of programs should be increased. Those who had not been notified regretted the omission. One school that had been notified but that did not participate abstained because the principal did not wish to entrust taking the children to the nearby public school, where they felt discipline was lacking, to relatively inexperienced teachers. The principals were unanimous in regretting the change in the Young Audiences programs; they preferred them held in their own schools as had been done previously.

5. Adaptive Physical Education

The Adaptive Physical Education Program for Physically Handicapped Children developed in District 14 was an after-school program specialized to meet the needs of boys who had a physical abnormality which interfered with their participation in the regular physical education program and with their social development. The program was in operation for the second year. It was in actual progress from October 1969 to June 1970. The program served all children in District 14, both those in public school and those in parochial school. The actual program was housed in four public schools, two intermediate and two elementary schools.

The objectives of the project were stated as follows:

1) To get the children involved in their physical education program.
2) To achieve optimum participation for each child on an individual basis.
3) To make each child aware of the nutritive values of a proper diet.
4) To have each child feel a sense of accomplishment.
5) To assist in the development of potential through adaptive efforts.

Evaluation of the children began with screening. Boys between the ages of ten and fourteen were considered eligible for the program. Names of possible candidates were submitted by teachers (regular classroom teachers or physical education teachers) and/or parents. The boys were recommended on the basis of a physical abnormality which was most likely to be the cause of poor physical activity and/or poor social behavior.

Each applicant was then interviewed by the coordinator of the program and by a staff member of the project who would be working in the school where he would be enrolled. If the child were felt to be a candidate for the special program on the basis of the screening interview, he was then given a battery of instruments. These included:

1) A physical examination. This was conducted by either the child's doctor or by the school doctor.

2) Semantic Differential Scale - An instrument developed by the assistant coordinator of the project and in the process of being standardized by him and the psychological consultant.

3) New York Physical Fitness Test - This test is designed to evaluate the subject's ability to perform a certain number of tasks in a prescribed amount of time. The subject is required to do so many push-ups, sit-ups, etc. as he is clocked with a stop watch. This instrument was designed as an outgrowth of the Kennedy physical fitness program.

4) Draw-a-Person Test - This particular instrument was used in a special way in this study. It was used to determine any changes in height, width, number of quadrants, and ratio of head to body and lower limbs. This would give an indication of the change in body image occuring as the child began to lose or gain weight.

5) Skin-fold Callibrator - This is an instrument designed to determine the per cent of body fat as over-against the amount of muscle.

Each of the above instruments was administered as a pre-test and as a post-test. The actual project evaluation was to be followed by an evaluation which was to measure height and weight, physical fitness, skill achievement, and sociological status within the peer group.

During the course of the program a chart of heights and weights was kept weekly to show the weight gains or losses of each child in the project. In addition a daily log of activities was kept by each member of the project staff.

The special program met from three to five P.M., three days per week. It was held in four centers scattered throughout District 14. The program began by serving 100 children, 85 of whom were still participating at the close of the school year. Each of the four groups served between 19 and 24 children. The majority of the children were determined to be medically obese. Some were underweight and a few were determined to have some specific handicap, i.e. slight physical involvement as a result of cerebral palsy, club feet, legally blind, and missing some fingers on one or both hands.

All public elementary and intermediate schools in District 14 sent children to the program and five parochial elementary schools participated. The make-up of the population included approximately fifty per cent from the public and fifty per cent from the parochial schools.

The staff consisted of nine fully qualified licensed physical education instructors. These men were all teachers in the public schools of the District and were participating in this project as an after-school assignment. This meant that, at least for the children who were from the public schools, they were working with children whom they either had in their regular physical education classes or whom they knew from their school.

The program was basically the same in each participating center. It was relaxed and informal, but definite structure was used to make certain the children received the desired instruction. Basically, the program concentrated in two areas. First, it was concerned with group and individually prescribed exercises which had been indicated as a result of the New York Physical Fitness Test. These exercises included such things as push-ups, sit-ups, jumping,bending, running, sommersaults, etc. The second emphasis followed the program set up for the regular physical education curriculum as used in the schools the boys were attending. The special program dropped the first unit of the regular curriculum and began working on the second in order to keep one step ahead of the regular program. Thus the boys could learn some of the basic skills for the sport being taught and develop some self-confidence so that they might begin to participate in the regular gym program which, for reasons of awkwardness or reluctance, they had not been willing to do. The curriculum included such sports as volleyball, gymnastics, soccer, basketball, and baseball. Following the lesson on the sport, the group was divided into teams and played an actual game in the sport until the end of the afternoon.

In addition to these program emphases, there was a weigh-in period each Tuesday. At that time, much like a weight-watchers club, each child was weighed in front of the others and his loss (or gain) or lack thereof, commented on. Diet was constantly discussed with the children in order to try to get follow-through with what had been discussed with the parents.

The parents of the children were also involved in the on-going program. They met with the District nutritionist twice during the program. At that time there was an attempt to work out diets that would be beneficial for the children. The nutritionist worked with an understanding of the income level and the major foods of the communities so that diets would fit what the family could afford and was used to eating. In addition to the meetings with the nutritionist, monthly parent meetings were held by the staff of the project. In that way they were able to reinforce diet and to keep the parents informed in regard to the development of the children. The parents were also asked at these times about the effect of the program, as they saw it.

The staff of the project kept in constant communication with the classroom teacher and the regular physical education teacher and with the child in his school and class. Each child was visited in his classroom once every two weeks by a member of the project staff. If a child was absent from the program, he was immediately visited in his school setting.

This included the parochial school children as well as the public school children.

The program provided such an excellent base in both exercise skills and the skills needed to perform in the regular gym class that all subjects showed significant growth in exercise skill, as indicated on the New York Physical Fitness Test, and all gained in the strength and coordination needed in the sports they were learning. For these children, most of whom had refused to put on a gym suit or to participate in the regular gym class before the special program, the effectiveness of the program could easily be gauged in the fact that all became proficient in the sport within the special group. Many of the children began to participate in their regular gym program - to the point where the teachers commented on their ability - and some of the children actually volunteered to be in organized sports taking place in their local community after school. Within the special group, all children had the opportunity to take a turn at being leader and follower, captain and organizer. Perhaps the most effective and looked-forward-to part of the program was "weigh-in day". The children took pride in weighing and discovering whether they had lost or gained.

Although all the test results are not completely analyzed, enough has been done to give some indication as to the direction of the outcome in terms of the growth in self-concept and body image. The tests scored show an increase in self-concept. This is further born out by the noted difference in personal hygiene and manners. Classroom teachers and principals commented particularly on the difference in the social attitude of the subject. The boys were taking much more interest in being part of the group and were showing evidence of a growing ability toward self-discipline. Many comments indicated that the children were becoming eager and active and were no longer withdrawn. This was particularly true in the gym class where participation and inclusion was noticed for the first time. Teachers commented on the close relationship between the staff and the children and added that, in perhaps fifty per cent of the cases, there had been an actual improvement in academic marks. Obviously, in the building of self-concept, the program was a great success.

The health and diet area, while showing some positive signs, was the area of greatest difficulty in the project. The program was responsible for the compiling of complete health records on every child. The children all had complete physicals which would not have happened without the project. However, even though monthly parents meetings were well attended and parents reported being pleased with the results of the project and having noticed positive changes in their sons, there was not enough individual contact between the staff of the project, the nutritionists, and the parents. Diet continued to be a problem throughout the project. Even though weight loss was substantial in some cases, some children gained weight and any control over diet seemed impossible.

6. Science Enrichment Program

The Science Enrichment Program organized by District 14 during the 1969-1970 school year was a recycling of a highly successful program conducted in the previous year. The program made provision for the establishment of an after-school science club in each of the elementary schools in the district. Thirty fourth and fifth grade students were enrolled in each club. The staff, in each school, consisted of a licensed teacher who was a specialist in science, who was assisted by paraprofessionals and student aides. Each student in the club program, which centered about the exploration of space, was required to complete an individual project. Bus trips were organized to supplement the work done in the club sessions.

The four major goals of the District 14 Science Club program as outlined in the program description were as follows:

a. To provide an enriched science course for a select group of fourth and fifth public and non-public school children.

b. To use the current interests in space exploration as a motivation for the study of man and his universe.

c. To tie in the highly motivational technique of model building with the allied scientific concepts and principles.

d. To widen the horizon of the participating children by field trips to appropriate facilities.

Although the program description submitted by the District made no mention of non-public school participation, 13 (3.1%) of the 415 students in the program attended parochial schools.

In view of the small number of non-public school participants, no attempt will be made to present an extensive evaluation here. The program, as appraised by the members of the evaluation team, was highly successful. Their conclusions, based on an extensive program of observations and interviews follow:

a. Project was extremely well organized and properly staffed by teachers with science backgrounds.

b. Students in the program were pleased and interested.

c. The project enlarged the knowledge of the children.

d. Rapport between teachers and students was exceptional.

e. Student trips aroused interest and proved to be valuable to students.

f. Parents were interested in the project.

g. Teachers in the project were enthusiastic and delighted with the children in the program.

h. Despite rooms that were poorly planned, the use of aides made possible maximum utility of rooms and lessened confusion.

L. District 15

1. After-School Study Center

After-School Study centers were established in ten public school buildings in District 15, four in the Sunset Park area and six in South Brooklyn. Classes met twice a week from 3:00 to 5:00 for a total of fifty sessions. "Remedial, compensatory and enrichment subjects" were offered, with emphasis on reading and English as a second language. Thirty eight teachers were recruited from the staffs of the ten schools and a school aide and a secretary were employed for each center. Two supervisors, one for each area, were selected from the principals in the district. Centers were available for pupils from all Title I eligible schools, public and non-public.

When last checked in April, only 36 pupils from non-public schools were reported on registers of all of the ten centers. Six of the non-public schools had no children participating. The reasons given by the principals of these schools were two: (a) many of their children did not live in the neighborhood and usually took busses home immediately after dismissal; and (b) parents of the others were too concerned about the dangers of traffic and personal incidents in the neighborhoods to permit their children to attend after school study centers. Although they recognized that many of their pupils needed after school tutoring, they felt that the only practical method was to conduct after school study centers in the non-public schools. The principals of the four non-public schools whose pupils did participate agreed with their colleagues that the program would have been much more effective had it been conducted in the non-public school of the individual child. These principals stated that their pupils who did attend the centers did not benefit much from the present after school study program because of the poor quality of teaching by the center staff.

In the opinion of the members of the evaluation team, this judgment of the non-public school principals was much too harsh. Observation of three of the centers in action indicated that the quality of remedial work offered was generally good, that pupil interest was high, and that pupil progress, where data were available, was greater than expectation based on previous performance. Questionnaires were completed by 22 teachers of the non-public school pupils. They were uniform in indicating improvement in academic work on the part of their pupils.

2. Saturday and Holiday Bus Trip Program

This program was designed to enable children from the public and non-public schools of District 15 to visit places of cultural and educational interest on Saturdays and holidays. Suggested were visits to museums, plays, puppet shows, exhibitions, and the Statue of Liberty. The bus teachers in conjunction with the educational assistants were to "plan the activities of each trip so that the children will gain the maximum advantage and devote their attention to those features that will best serve their cultural and educational interests." Approximately 900 school children were to be served. Three non-public schools were to take part in the program.

A Parent Program Assistant was to work as liaison between the schools and the community, to alert the parents as to the value of the trips. He was to assist in the scheduling and coordinating of the activities, foreview the places of interest and discuss the forthcoming trip with faculty and parents.

Two of the three designated non-public schools each took part in seven trips, while the third, although scheduled for three, took part in only one. One of the schools with an enrollment of 884 pupils was unable to give any child more than one trip, while the second, with a considerably smaller enrollment, was able to give the children the opportunity to go at least twice or three times. This was also partly possible because some children did not go at all, due to lack of parental permission.

Observers accompanied two trips, one with each of the schools that took several trips. It was evident that the trips were well organized. The Coordinator of the program arrived prior to the trip to check on buses and children. Each trip was accompanied by one public school teacher who directed proceedings, as well as two non-public school teachers who had been certified and approved as educational assistants. Snacks were provided on the return journey.

Trips were made to the Statue of Liberty, Oyster Bay, Flushing Meadows, and several to playhouses. Some of the plays seen were Robin Hood, Hansel and Gretel, Johnny Appleseed, and the Thief of Bagdad.

Principals and teachers interviewed were unanimous in reporting that they felt that the trips were valuable to these children from an educational and cultural point of view. They also indicated that parents were pleased that their children were having these opportunities. However, the parents felt more secure when Sisters accompanied their children on the trips. The only times that parents did not consent to their children taking trips were when they interfered with other plans.

In the school which participated little, the principal expressed the opinion that these trips would have been valuable especially for his children since they otherwise had no opportunity to participate in American cultural life. However, due to the fact that all the children are bused in to the school, Saturday trips were not feasible, especially since the parents did not care to bring the children to the school themselves. It was suggested that more flexibility would have enabled these trips to take place on a school day or to arrange a pick-up of these children on Saturdays.

Principals stated that the trips would be more profitable to the children if teachers were able to accompany their own classes. However, attempts had been made to prepare the children to ensure greatest educational value. Observers noted that children seemed, in general, well prepared to gain benefit from what they were to see. Children's comments both to and from the site indicated eagerness and interest in the educational and cultural aspects of the site visited, as well as the pleasures of an outing.

In common with many previous evaluations of trip programs such as this, observers noted relatively little follow-up activity after the children had participated in the trip. For the most part, the trip was looked upon as an end in itself, rather than a part of a total educational experience.

No evidence was found of any activities of a Parent Program Assistant in the non-public schools, either through interviews or observations. The Coordinator planned the trips, asking for suggestions from the schools.

M. District 16

1. Early Childhood Library

The Early Childhood Library was developed to provide children in Grades K-2 with services and materials which, it was hoped, would enrich their reading experiences. All of the eligible non-public schools in the district, with the exception of three which chose not to participate, were involved in the program. Space was rented in the Junior Academy, a non-public school, to house the program.

The Library made available, through individual and class visits and circulation to home and school, books and audiovisual materials emphasizing urban life. Many of the books featured stories about Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Teachers of classes visiting the Library were familiarized with the techniques of using trade books and related audiovisual materials in the teaching of reading. A teacher specializing in the use of audiovisual techniques was employed to introduce children to films, filmstrips, records, and other audiovisual materials, as part of the overall program, which included story telling and creative dramatics.

The program did not begin operating until the middle of February 1970. The long delay was occasioned by the need to renovate the rented space. The program accomodated two classes per period, with four periods, each lasting from 45 minutes to one hour, per day. Children were brought to the program site by bus. The first instructional period began at 9:30 A.M. or later, if the bus was delayed. There were 20 instructional periods per week; non-public schools were alloted four to seven periods of these 20. In all, 35 different classes visited the Library a total of 100 times. Attendance at the Library proved to be excellent, although a few classes cancelled their visits at the last moment. In such instances, no substitution was possible.

The Library was amply stocked with multi-ethnic books and audiovisual equipment. In the course of a week, from approximately 750 to 900 books were circulated among children and teachers. Retrieval of books was a problem, in that it was necessary to provide for return of books by groups other than those that had borrowed them.

The singing of songs, the stories that were told, and the viewing of interesting films created an atmosphere of pupil involvement in which laughter, enjoyment, and enthusiasm prevailed. (It was a rare treat for the observers to watch the program in operation.) Pupil enthusiasm was reflected in letters written to program personnel, and in remarks of children who visited the Library:

"We loved our visit to the library."

"Thank you for my book. I loved it."

Teachers interviewed after completing their visit to the Library commented:

"It was a beautiful experience for the children."

"The presentation of the Library personnel was magnificent."

"The pupils should now have a greater appreciation of the importance of reading."

A comment made by one of the Library assistants, who was a graduate Library Science student at Pratt Institute, perhaps sums up the value of the program:

"This program enables me to see what is true and real. I am learning in a real-life situation, helping children who need Library Services very badly."

2. Parent Involvement

The Parent Involvement Program was introduced in District 16 in February 1968. Its primary goal was to strengthen school-community relationships by giving parents a sense of involvement in the education of their children. Other aims of the program included:

a. To give the parents a role in school programs
b. To widen the educational and cultural horizons of the parents
c. To provide parents with materials to use at home to help their children
d. To help parents understand how reading is taught
e. To establish closer parent-teacher cooperation in improving the child's achievement in school.

Eight non-public schools were invited to participate in the programs; all but one accepted. All parent workshops that were organized were held in public school buildings during the school day, and were directed to parents of children in grades Kg. through 3. Activities such as trips were held on weekends or after school.

Although considerable time and effort were expended on trying to involve non-public school parents, few of them participated in the program on a regular basis. A non-public school parent, in general, preferred to become involved with the parent-teacher association of her child's school. Attendance of non-public school parents in Parent Involvement workshops ranged from 0 to 11; usually attendance varied from 1 to 3. Project personnel attempted to enlist parents by distributing bilingual flyers, letters, and brochures, and by distributing a program newsletter to children in non-public schools.

The parents that attended project workshops discussed a wide variety of topics, and were kept abreast of curriculum developments through observation of demonstration lessons given to classes at various levels. A conference was held after each lesson, at which methods and materials utilized in the lesson were analyzed. Parents were also given materials for use in helping their children.

Parent turnout for trips was quite good, averaging between 15 and 30. Trips were taken to Sterling Forest Gardens, Hofstra College, the UN, Chinatown, and Battery Park.

Family assistants were assigned to work in the program in the public schools; no comparable position was made available in non-public schools. Regular staff meetings sought means of increasing involvement of parents in non-public schools, but despite scheduling of what were considered attractive workshops in Afro-Hispanic Culture and Arts and Crafts, non-public school involvements remained small.

Reaction to the program on the part of involved parents was generally favorable. Parents expressed varying reasons for participation:

"I will be able to learn things from other parents and teachers about how to help my child with his school work."

"I'll do anything to help my child."

"I want to know what's going on in the school."

A comment made by one of the teachers who taught a demonstration lesson and then led a discussion with the eight parents who observed it sums up the strengths and weaknesses of the program:

"The parents are always interested and ask good questions. But not enough of them come. The ones who do come are the parents of the children who are doing well in school. How do we get the parents of non-achievers to participate?"

3. Operation Target

Operation Target was designed to give special educational assistance to students from grades 5 through 9 whose emotional problems caused them to fall two or more years below grade level in reading. Pupils in CRMD classes, truants, and children who were already receiving treatment from a social agency were not eligible for the program. In addition to helping children with reading and emotional problems, the program had as a goal working with parents of the involved children, school personnel, and community agencies, in order to obtain their cooperation for the benefit of the children.

Operation Target serviced 70 children, 13 of whom were drawn from non-public schools. All but one of the eligible non-public schools in the district were involved. Pupils who were referred to the program were seen by an educational therapist, a skilled teacher, in an informal screening session. The pupil's school grades were reviewed and, if deemed necessary, a psychological work-up was completed by the part-time school psychologist assigned to the program. A family assistant made regular visits to the home to discuss pupil progress. Psychiatric help was also available on a part-time basis. Additional instructional time was provided for Operation Target students attending public schools after school hours. This additional time was not available to non-public school pupils, who were limited to the standard instruction and therapy provided in the one hour weekly session available to all participants.

Reactions by the teachers of the children accepted for the program were uniformly favorable:

"My child is reading much better."

"The program has given her a great deal of self-confidence."

"My child is behaving much better now."

"The program really gets results."

Reading test results were available for participants in the program:

Child	Grade	Reading Grades Pre-Test	Reading Grades Post-Test	Gain or Loss (Months)	Time in Program
A	8	5.5	7.0	+15	12
B	8	5.5	4.3	-12	12
C	7	3.1	4.7	+16	8
D	7	4.0	4.6	+6	6
E	8	4.3	4.5	+2	11
F	7	4.2	4.5	+3	5
G	7	4.9	7.8	+29	12
H	7	3.6	6.0	+24	6
I	7	4.5	5.1	+6	3
J	7	4.8	6.0	+12	12
K	8	4.0	5.6	+16	6
L	7	2.6	3.5	+9	10

When one considers that these were children with severe emotional problems, the gains are truly impressive.

Program personnel kept records of pupil report card entries. Examination of these records indicates that the pupils' overall scholastic performance and conduct were uniformly higher since their admission to the program.

The reports of the children in an interview reflected their awareness of their improvement; and their relationship to program personnel:

"I'm now doing better in school."

"I'm learning how to read now."

"I'm getting lots of help."

"My teacher really cares about me."

"I want to do better, because I want everyone who has helped me to be proud of me."

N. District 17

1. Homework Helper Program in Hebrew Day Schools

The Homework Helper Program organized in District 17 was very similar to that developed in District 14. The project was set up to serve 60 children, 33 of them enrolled in upper elementary grades (4,5,6) and 27 in secondary grades (7-12) in four Hebrew Day Schools located in District 17. The Homework Helper Centers were located in two of the four schools: Beth Rivkah and Prospect Park Secondary School. Each center was in operation two afternoons a week, for two hours, from three to five, for forty sessions. The staff of each center consisted of a teacher with a New York City Board of Education teaching license, an educational assistant living in the district, and ten Homework Helpers from the upper grades of the schools.

The goals of the program were to help the children improve their reading skills and to develop independent study and work skills. For the tutors, the goals were to improve their own academic skills and to provide them with needed financial assistance.

The Project Teachers are well qualified for their part in the project; they are mature, sympathetic adults with experience in both public and non-public schools. The educational assistants were longtime residents of the District, with academic qualifications well beyond expectations; one was a student in a local teachers seminary, the other a graduate of Brooklyn College. The tutors were in the 11th or 12th grades of the Hebrew Secondary schools, almost all of them "good" or "superior" students. The supervisor of the project had had several years experience in the Title I Homework Helper Projects and was currently an assistant of the citywide coordinator of the Title I Homework Helper Projects of the New York City Board of Education.

The tutors reported that they had gained a great deal from the program in understanding of themselves and the children they tutored; many reported that they had learned how to improve their own study habits. They experienced satisfaction in being able to help others, in learning that one of their "tutees" had shown improvement in her classwork. Some saw gains in themselves in growth of patience, persistence in attaining a set goal, and vocational interest in teaching. They were all grateful of an opportunity to earn money and happy at being successful on a "real job".

Classroom teachers reported to their principals that over "ninety percent" of their pupils being tutored showed improvement. They reported that many of the pupils had developed a personal attachment to the tutors and enjoyed the individual tutoring sessions.

The principals of the four schools were unanimous in recommending recycling of the project. All felt that the project should begin in September, and should operate four afternoons a week.

O. District 23

1. Afternoon Study Center at Hunter Point

This program was to operate at St. Mary's School on Tuesdays and Thursdays from October 15th to May 15th between 3:15 and 5:15 P.M. Children from three public schools and children from St. Mary's were to be serviced.

Pupils registered in this program were to get remedial help in reading or arithmetic or were to be involved in an art program.

Funds were to be allocated for snacks and classroom supplies by the Board of Education. St. Mary's School was to provide classrooms, storage supplies and custodial services.

The program was implemented as projected, with two major exceptions: (a) only children from St. Mary's School attended although the program was open to public school as well as non-public school pupils; (b) many of the supplies were not received from the Board of Education, and the teachers contributed much of the material.

Interviews with the principal and teachers involved in the program at St. Mary's School indicated that they were very pleased with the program. The art classes, in particular, were singled out for mention - the school does not provide a program in art in its curriculum. Interviews with parents revealed that they considered the program of value for two reasons - not only were their children receiving help, but they were being kept off the streets, an important consideration for many of these parents, where both mother and father held jobs.

Children in this program, as in practically all other programs involving individualization, were very enthusiastic about participation.

All but a few felt that they were making good progress; in this, they were joined by the teachers.

2. Evening Guidance Clinic at J.H.S. 204

This program was designed to offer individual counseling, assistance in making educational and vocational plans, and remedial help and tutoring in reading to students attending four public schools and three non-public schools (St. Mary, St. Demetrios, and Transfiguration). Parents as well as children were to receive help when necessary. The Clinic was in operation two evenings a week, during the hours of 6:00 and 9:00 P.M., and was staffed by guidance counselors, reading specialists, a social worker, and a psychologist. Educational assistants assisted the teachers who served as reading specialists.

As the program was implemented, only one non-public school (St. Mary's) was involved. Some children from other non-public schools, not on the list of approved non-public schools, also received service. According to the principals of St. Demetrios and Transfiguration Schools, a letter describing the program had been received, but the program to be offered was not clarified.

Observation of the program indicated that it was successful in meeting its goals. Pre- and post-tests in reading indicated that participants showed an average growth in reading of a full year. Teachers and administrators interviewed were unanimous in reporting improved classroom functioning in other than academic areas. Outside referrals for assistance were made when necessary; follow-up, based upon an excellent system of record-keeping, was of a high order. Parents and pupils were enthusiastic about the help they had received.

P. District 28

1. P.S. 40 Enrichment Program

In spite of its designation, this enrichment program was a typical trip program, in which approximately 100 parents and children from P.S. 40 and the St. Monica School participated. Ten trips were taken on Saturdays to such destinations as the Statue of Liberty, museums, and historical sites, in an attempt to enrich the backgrounds of the parents and the children. Trips were to be planned cooperatively by the PTA, the principal, and the Community Relations Coordinator of P.S. 40. Parents of children attending St. Monica School were also asked to participate in this determination. Provision was made, according to the program description, for an elaborate internal evaluation of the program.

This trip program had the same strengths and weaknesses of the other trip programs that have been evaluated in previous studies. The trip was an enjoyable experience for parents and children, and many of the parents interviewed indicated that they would continue a week-end trip program on their own after the close of the school year. This program did provide an opportunity for two school groups (approximately 25 per cent of the participants were from a non-public school) to get to know each other.

As a learning experience, however, the value of the trip may be questioned. There apparently was little effort to prepare the children for the trip, and even less in follow-up activities. The non-public school principal reported that he had virtually no contact with the coordinator of the program, and received word concerning destination too soon before the trip to plan adequately for preparing for the trip.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are two approaches that might be used in presenting a series of recommendations concerning non-public school participation in district decentralized Title I programs. One might consider each one of the many programs that have been discussed, and outline suggestions for a recycled program, if the program has been adjudged of value, or recommend discontinuance of the program, if it has been found to be inadequate. The evaluation team feels that such a procedure would be of little value - to some degree, the evaluators, stressing as they did non-public school participation, could not judge the total impact of a program, particularly if the program involved public school as well as non-public school pupils and personnel. As a consequence, the members of the evaluation team have opted for a second approach. A series of generalized recommendations cutting across specific programs will be presented, with the understanding that at least one exception to a generalization can be found in the large number of projects that were reviewed. Bearing this stricture in mind, then, the following general recommendations are advanced:

1. Greater provision should be made for the involvement of non-public school personnel (particularly the administrators of non-public schools) in the planning phase of the development of Title I programs. Even a casual reading of the requests for funding submitted by the districts will reveal that, in general, there was little participation in the planning process by representatives of the non-public schools. Further evidence of this lack of involvement was gathered in interviews with principals of non-public

schools - time and again, they had no inkling of the fact that a program for which their school was eligible was under way in the district. It would appear, then, that the present procedure of providing liaison personnel in the Office of State and Federally Assisted Programs for the Non-Public Schools and at the diocesan offices has not resulted in adequate communication to the schools concerning the availability of district decentralized Title I programs. An invitation to all of the administrators of non-public schools in a given district to attend all sessions of the group responsible for planning would decentralize the process of communication, and act as a powerful force to break down the attitude of distrust sensed by the members of the evaluation team.

Greater awareness of the total program in a given district on the part of non-public school personnel would also be of help in implementing this second recommendation:

2. Greater provision should be made for the participation of non-public school pupils in the decentralized Title I programs organized by the individual districts. In program after program, members of the evaluation team were surprised to find that a relatively meagre number of non-public school children were involved in what appeared to be a highly worthwhile activity. Although most program coordinators attributed such low enrollment of non-public school children to lack of interest, this does not seem to be the overriding factor in many instances. The lack of knowledge on the part of administrators of non-public schools that a program was available to their children has already been mentioned, and is symptomatic of a need for better communication:

3. Improved lines of communication should be established between Title I coordinators and the non-public schools. Non-public schools must be advised of their eligibility for participation in a given program, and the number of places available to their children should be specified by the District Title I Coordinator. In most instances, responsibility for such notification has been delegated to program coordinators, some of whom evidently look with little sympathy on non-public school participation in Title I programs, and apparently do little to encourage such participation. One may well question the motives of a program coordinator who sends the following note to a non-public school principal:

"We have an After School Study Center for which you are eligible to send children. However, we have more than filled the available space with our own children and are presently working on a waiting list. If there is anyone you would care to add to our waiting list we would gladly do so if you will send us the information. Please feel free to call me at any time."

One can readily forecast what the extent of non-public school participation in this After School Study Center would be. This leads to another recommendation:

4. To be considered acceptable, non-public school involvement in a given program, must represent more than merely token participation. While it is ordinarily difficult to determine, prior to the organization of a given program, what "acceptable" participation would represent in terms of student enrollment, it is a relatively simple task to define non-acceptable participation. For example, setting an arbitrary 10 per cent of the available places in a given program aside for non-public school pupils

might be considered adequate if the program is to enroll a total of 300 pupils, but not (and this is an actual instance) if the program is to enroll a total of 30 pupils and the 10 per cent allotment is to be divided among three schools. One child per school does not constitute non-public school "participation."

Unfortunately, there were too many programs in which involvement of the non-public schools, at best, would be considered only token in nature. Indeed, there were many programs, ostensibly permitting non-public school participation, that did not attract a single non-public school child. It is not surprising that most of these programs were conducted during the school day, in a public school building. Scheduling a given program during school hours, and expecting the non-public school to disrupt its normal schedule and send children to the public school to participate is foolhardy. Moreover, experience has amply demonstrated that parents of non-public school children are loathe to permit them to travel to public schools for after-school programs. While there may be no basis for their fears in actual fact, over and over again, the members of the evaluation team found parents expressing the feeling that their children would be molested in a public school setting. There is only one way to overcome this resistance on the part of such parents:

5. Wherever possible, programs that are to involve participation of non-public school pupils should be located in a non-public school building. While this will insure greater attendance of non-public school pupils, one can also be certain that parents of pupils enrolled in public schools will be unwilling to have their children travel to a non-public school. In short, if a high level of registration is to be attained in programs

open to both public and non-public school pupils, it might be well to organize two program centers, one in a public and one in a non-public school. At times, a neutral zone, such as a community settlement house, may be acceptable to both parties.

To be sure, placing a program in a non-public school gives rise to other problems. Normally, the so-called "Title I teachers" assigned to such programs are licensed New York City school teachers. As such, questions immediately arise concerning the lines of authority that are in force - from what source does the teacher take direction? A problem also arises concerning assignment of paraprofessionals, who are utilized in virtually every program that is currently organized. At present, paraprofessionals serving in non-public schools are limited to assisting Title I teachers, although their services might be much more helpful if they were assigned to assist other classroom teachers. While the evaluation team does not wish to raise questions concerning the legal aspects of the current ruling limiting the scope of the services to be performed by teachers and educational assistants serving in non-public schools, the merits of the situation lead to the following recommendation:

6. The functions to be performed by teachers and paraprofessionals serving in non-public schools should be determined jointly by the program coordinator and the administrator of the non-public school. It follows, therefore, where the major objective of a given program is providing a corps of paraprofessionals to serve in non-public schools, with no specific function within a specified program, the assignment to specific duties should rest with the principal of the non-public school. In short, principals of non-public schools must be given much more freedom to deploy personnel in accordance with the educational needs of the school.

Acceptance of this recommendation, of course, would mean that principals of non-public schools would play some role in the total Title I framework. Members of the evaluation team would suggest that this role be expanded to an even greater degree:

7. Administrators of non-public schools should participate in the process of recruitment and training of the Title I teachers and paraprofessionals. Throughout the course of this evaluative study, principals of non-public schools voiced the complaint that "the people working with our children are trying their best to do a good job, but they don't know anything about our school and what we are trying to do." The involvement of non-public school personnel in the program of recruitment and training would go a long way in eliminating this negative feeling.

Other negative feelings, however, will be much more difficult to dispel. Another current attitude was stated by a non-public school principal as follows: We are short-changed when it comes to personnel. Not only are we given fewer teachers and paras then we should be given, but they are always the ones with the least experience and the poorest know-how." Of course, this judgment is far too sweeping - in many programs, the same teachers work with both public and non-public school pupils, and very often, have no knowledge of the school of origin of the pupil. This, to be sure, is unfortunate, because it makes it impossible for the Title I teacher to report back to the classroom teacher of the non-public school pupil with whom she is working. This leads to another recommendation:

8. Greater provision should be made for feedback concerning progress of pupils to the classroom teacher of non-public school pupils participating

in Title I programs. This implies correction of a major weakness of existing programs, as observed by the evaluation team:

9. Provision should be made for maintaining comprehensive and accurate records concerning participation of non-public school pupils in Title I programs. In some instances, observers noted an almost lackadaisical attitude on the part of program coordinators concerning non-public school participation in Title I programs: "If they come, fine; if they don't come, fine. I don't conceive it to be my function to draw up trade from the parochial schools, or from the public schools, for that matter." In several instances, the willingness to accept pupils in a program without too much concern led to the servicing of non-public school pupils attending ineligible schools. While such enrollment may be an excellent way of building good will in a community, it is a violation of the guidelines established for Title I. Proper record maintenance would serve to eliminate enrollment of non-eligibles, and provide the basis for a controlled program of feedback to classroom teachers.

This mention of guidelines gives rise to another recommendation:

10. Care must be taken to organize programs as they are described in project proposals; deviations should not be permitted. In several instances, observers noted deviations, in terms of program scope, and in terms of assignments, duties, and numbers of personnel, from the original specifications set in project proposals. In one instance, the entire flavor of a program was changed from one that emphasized guidance to one that stressed bilingual education. In another, a family assistant served in a school office as a general educational assistant. In a third, only

50 per cent of the personnel scheduled for assignment actually reported for service. This list could be extended at great length.

Although modification of guidelines in the light of local needs is important, such modification should be worked through in the early planning stages of a given project. Care must be taken not to subvert the original concept of a program under the guise of "adaptation to local school needs."

A consideration of guidelines, too, returns this discussion to the attitude of "short-changing" on the part of non-public school personnel. At the present time, there is no formula that governs the extent to which a given district must incorporate non-public school pupils and personnel in its decentralized Title I programs. The charge has frequently been made that eligible non-public school children do not receive benefits and services under Title I comparable to their peers in public schools. Without going into the merits of this accusation, a recommendation concerning practice appears to be in order:

11. The Central Board of Education should develop a series of criteria (population of eligible pupils, allocation of percentage of budgeted funds, and the like) to guide local school districts in apportioning services to public and non-public schools. Members of the evaluation team do not wish to be drawn into a controversy concerning how much the relative allocation of funds to public and private schools should be. However, the formulation of a set of standards for implementation of Title I programs, cooperatively developed by representatives of the public and private sector, would not only answer the question of "how much", but would be of tremendous value in reducing the all-too-prevalent mistrust and suspicion in both the public and non-public school sectors.

APPENDIX

Members of the Evaluation Team:

Evaluation Director:	Dr. Joseph Justman, Director Institute for Research and Evaluation School of Education, Fordham University
Consultants:	Dr. Anthony Baratta, Professor Chairman, Division of Administration and Supervision School of Education, Fordham University
	Dr. Sheldon Marcus, Assistant Professor
	Dr. Eleanor Kelly, Assistant Professor
	Dr. Ruth Korey, Associate Professor Division of Curriculum and Teaching School of Education, Fordham University
	Dr. Joan Fairchild, Assistant Professor Division of Foundations, Psychology, and Services School of Education, Fordham University
	Dr. Leonard Brickman, Associate Dean Hofstra University
Research Assistants:	Mr. George Weinberg Mrs. Wendy Oxman
Research Technicians:	Sister Loretta Butler Sister Louise Zdunich Mr. Jay Sexton Alex Shames
Graduate Assistants:	Miss Lynne F. Goodman Mr. Michael Fiorentino Mr. Leo Hacker Mr. Richard Restiano Mr. Leonard M. Shames Miss Janet Smith Miss Joan Wiley Mr. Rudolph Mattiace Mrs. Shirley L. Morrison Mr. Matthew Glowski
Secretary:	Miss Susan Imbornoni

END
DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE
U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION
ERIC
DATE FILMED

5 2 72